

JPRS-UPA-89-002  
10 JANUARY 1989



---

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

---

***Political Affairs***

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-002

### CONTENTS

10 JANUARY 1989

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Readers Offer Views on Proposed Legislative Reforms [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 26 Oct 88]	1
First Secretary Polozkov Criticized at Krasnodar Party Conference	2
Afonin Addresses Kuibyshev Oblast Party Conference	2
Gorkiy Obkom First Secretary Reviews Citizens' Complaints	
[V. Pinigin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 6 Nov 88]	3
Minsk Obkom Chief on Party Elections, Scaling Down Oblast Apparatus	
[V. Voronetskiy; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, 12-18 Nov 88]	5
UkSSR Officials on Elections, Mass Media, Other Issues	
[V. Malakhov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 13 Oct 88]	8

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

New BSSR CP CC Commission to Investigate Repressions	
[Ye. Gorelik; SELSKAYA GAZETA, 11 Oct 88]	14
Stalin Foes Syrtsov, Lominadze, Others Rehabilitated	
[A. Kolganov; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 8 Nov 88]	17
Founder of Belorussian Republic Chervyakov Rehabilitated	
[V. Mekhov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 5 Nov 88]	20

#### RELIGION

Law on Freedom of Conscience, Growth of Religious Groups in Lithuania Viewed	
[P. Anilenis; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 11 Nov 88]	24
Ecclesiastical Academy Is Opened in Tbilisi [M. Tsverava; MOLODEZH GRUZII, 4 Oct 88]	25
Rayon Official Defended for Participation in Religious Funeral	
[A. Teplyuk; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 26 Oct 88]	27
Journalist Against Using Force on Believers; Backs Religious Freedom	
[A. Chudakov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 11 Oct 88]	28

#### CULTURE

Chief of Filmmakers' Union Interviewed [K. Marinin; OGONEK No 44, 29 Oct-5 Nov 88]	30
Filmmakers Union Secretary Eldar Ryazanov Interviewed	
[O. Halyas, O. Milkus; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 1 Oct 88]	34
Aymatov on Plans for Foreign Literature Journal [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 21 Sep 88]	36
Writers Union Voices Support for Stalin Victims Memorial [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 21 Sep 88]	37

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

Call for 'Lawyers Union' Renewed [V. Vlasikhin; IZVESTIYA, 11 Nov 88]	39
Role of Komsomol, Political Clubs Debated	40
MVD Statistics Document Anti-Alcohol Campaign's Failure	
[V. Kondakov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 28 Nov 88]	41
Failure of Anti-Alcohol Campaign in Kirghizia Acknowledged	
[R. Gentsle; KOMMUNIST KIRGIZSTANA No 10, Oct 88]	43

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

Estonian Draft Law on Language Discussed	47
Academic Lotman Comments [Yu. Lotman; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 30 Oct 88]	47
Press Conference Held [P. Raydla; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 30 Oct 88]	48
Public Discussion Procedures Explained [K. Propst; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 30 Oct 88]	50
Medvedev Speaks at 'Yekabpils' Agrofirm [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 17 Nov 88]	51
LISSR Second Secretary Mitkin Interviewed [M. Barisas; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 18 Oct 88]	56

Lithuania Views Independent Economic Ties to West .....	59
Contacts With US Banks, Businesses [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 21 Oct 88] .....	59
Brėzauskas on Finnish, Scandinavian Contacts [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 25 Oct 88] .....	60
Official Resistance to Talaka Society Noted [A. Semukha; VEK XX I MIR No 7, 88] .....	60
Journalist Poznyak on Stalinist Atrocities at Kuropaty [Z. Poznyak; MOSCOW NEWS No 41, 16-23 Oct 88] .....	60
Academician on Stalinist-Imposed Famine in Ukraine [S. Kulchitskiy; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 16 Oct 88] ..	63
Azerbaijani Researcher Predicts Ecological 'Death Sentence' for Caspian [A. Kasymov, A. Nikolskiy; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 10 Sep 88] .....	64
UzSSR: Medical Official on Pesticide Abuse Threat to Public Health [Yu. Kruzhilin; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 9 Sep 88] .....	66
Evenk AO: Ecological Concerns Spawn Resistance to Turukhanskaya GES [Ye. Gontmakher; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 30 Aug 88] .....	67
UzSSR: Foreign Tourism Seen as Key to Khorezm's Social, Economic Advancement [E. Iodkovskiy, et al; OGONEK No 39, 24 Sep-1 Oct 88] .....	69

## **Readers Offer Views on Proposed Legislative Reforms**

18000106 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Oct 88 p 1

[Letters to the editors: "Towards the Sovereignty of Soviets: Discussing Draft Laws"]

### **It Does Not Come with the Job**

[Text] It is very important that the numerous suggestions on improving the Soviet political system, expressed at meetings in labor collectives and social organizations and in people's letters before and after the All-Union Party Conference, be taken into consideration in the drafts of new USSR laws. Our political system and electoral practice are adopting an entirely new quality which reflects the essence of the changes occurring in the country.

Many long-desired legislative norms on the soviets and people's deputies have great significance for us, practical workers. Proposals from local areas, such as increasing the term of office of soviets to 5 years and the formation of presidiums, beginning with rayon and city soviets, were taken into consideration. I am convinced that it is necessary to extend the release of people's deputies for a longer time period in order to work in representative bodies and among the population, simultaneously preserving labor relations with the collectives which nominated them, to the local soviets as well. I see the sessions of local soviets as being more prolonged than they are today, more the efficient and decisive, and not held merely for the sake of having meetings.

It is important to note that, henceforth, the title of deputy does not come with a job: an entire set of officials, who previously comprised up to 15-20 percent of the deputy corps, will not be elected deputies now. It will probably be difficult to rid ourselves from the habit which has formed, in which a chief is mandatorily a deputy. I think that such a provision must also be stipulated in the draft Law on Local Self-Management.

L. Dubov, head, organizational and instruction department of Ivanovo Oblispolkom.

### **Why Combine?**

The draft laws presented for discussion provide a new impetus for the development of socialist democracy. Unquestionably, the documents require careful study and must be read thoroughly. However, I assume, it would be right to share one's initial thoughts, for instance, on whom we wish to see as our USSR people's deputy.

We have become accustomed to the fact that our elected officials are essentially leading workers in industry, outstanding brigade leaders and important economic, party and soviet workers. Article 124 of the draft Law states

that people's deputies of the USSR are to be released from performing their service or production duties during the time needed to carry out deputy work. They will not only participate in sessions, but also work on committees and commissions and among the population. Does this mean that they are professional parliamentarians for a certain period of time? It is also important to find candidates for deputy who would consider their parliamentary duty to be the most necessary work. Here, we must also keep in mind the fact that not all jobs permit long absences, even if these absences are related to fulfilling deputy responsibilities.

Can a deputy accurately reflect the people's interest? Does he have an active civic position in the analysis of the problems? Does he have sufficient energy and erudition? These will probably be the selection criteria. After all, deputies will have to draft, propose and defend bills.

Under the conditions of increasing the activeness of deputies, I think that it is inexpedient to combine offices, even in the two soviets. Perhaps, the draft should be edited. Should the election of a deputy to a higher body of state power entail his release from other deputy responsibilities?

F. Vzhasso, Koshekhabl'skiy CPSU Raykom first secretary, Krasnodar Kray.

### **Where is Leadership?**

Familiarity with the draft Law has led me to thoughts not only theoretical in nature, but also related to my personal, often bitter, deputy experience. I recalled a recent session of the Kirovskiy Rayon Soviet in Rostov. After a 2-hour, involved discussion of the ispolkom's report, one of the deputies suggested not approving the draft resolution worked out by the ispolkom, since it "was prepared in the spirit of stagnation times and lacks a specific program of actions." V. Madyuga, rayispolkom chairman, to the deputies' surprise, instead of defending the proposed draft, agreed that it was in fact far from perfect:

"However, this is the soviet's document, and not the ispolkom's. Precisely you, the deputies, should improve and change it, and not just criticize."

The disturbance turned out to be unnecessary: the resolution was passed and the ispolkom's work for the report period was "essentially approved," just like in the "good old days." In my opinion, this story, like a mirror, reflects the specific features of today's relations between the soviet and the ispolkom. Deputies no longer wish to remain in the position of outside observers. Yet at the same time, meanwhile, they do not know how to use power and often do not have real opportunities to implement their own rights. As far as the ispolkom—the administrative structure—is concerned, one gets the impression that even now it is ready to make room for and to share times of "glory" with the deputies for



failures in economic management, for the difficult situation in the municipal economy, health care and trade. However, do the soviets and their deputies need this kind of "increase in their roles and responsibilities?"

What is the solution? It is clearly stipulated in the draft constitutional changes. One of the main ideas of the document being discussed is overcoming the supervision of executive bodies over the soviets as joint authorities, ensuring a strict "division of labor" between representative and executive power and the clear delineation of their functions.

In my view, the main thing is to strengthen the characteristic of the soviets (at all levels) as "working corporations," as Lenin taught. This will be ensured by strengthening their control functions, above all with regard to the executive bodies.

It is possible to conclude that the proposed changes to the Constitution provide a good legal basis for restoring the sovereignty of the soviets and for implementing the reform of the entire political system.

It is well known that in any state there can (and should) be only a single supreme body, although there can also be several higher bodies of power. The supreme body, occupying a leading place, has the most requisite competence and heads the entire system of bodies of state power. Henceforth, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies should be this body. Meanwhile, it is defined in Article 108 only as a higher, and not as the supreme body of state power in the USSR. Therefore, the formulation of the corresponding article is in need of refinement.

At the same time, the body of popular representation which is second in terms of significance, the USSR Supreme Soviet, is preserving its nature as supreme in its name, although it will not be such now. Its new place will be to act as a higher, but not supreme authority. In consideration of this, I suggest discussing the possibility of renaming it, for instance, the People's Soviet of the USSR (and, correspondingly, people's soviets of union and autonomous republics). I think that the nature of the Supreme Soviet as an administrative body (Article 111) is unwarranted. According to the Constitution, the USSR Council of Ministers is the higher executive and administrative body, and it would be possible to erroneously conclude that henceforth we will have two higher administrative bodies. Such a decision would not contribute to separating the functions of legislative and executive power. Perhaps, it would be more precise to formulate the first part of Article 111 as follows: "...A higher, permanently functioning body of state power, which fulfills legislative functions in combination with the organization and control of implementation."

There is yet another consideration. I think that the constitutional nature of the new model for the soviets should not begin with Chapter 12 of the Basic Law. It should begin with the second article, which needs to be

edited with consideration for the present-day understanding of the place and role of the soviets. Other structural parts of the Constitution are also in need of certain changes, beginning with its preamble, which ought to reflect the new concept of state and social development.

N. Bondar, deputy of the Kirovskiy Rayon Soviet, candidate of juridical sciences, Rostov-na-Donu.

#### By a Real Majority...

Imagine a situation in which voting on every matter in the Congress of People's Deputies gave, for example, advantage to one or two voices. If one is to judge formally, the principle of the debate about the majority's opinion is upheld and the resolution becomes mandatory for universal observance. However, is this sufficiently realistic when not quite half are opposed? A minimal advantage is a precarious advantage. The implementation of many decisions made by voting most often requires significant outlays by the people. Are these expedient if only slightly more than half of the voters are interested in solving a given problem?

Therefore, I think that Article 108 of the draft Law should be edited as follows: "the USSR Congress of People's Deputies makes the laws of the USSR and resolutions by a majority of no fewer than two thirds of the vote of the total number of USSR people's deputies."

S. Manukov, Stavropol.

#### First Secretary Polozkov Criticized at Krasnodar Party Conference

18000337 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian, 29 Dec 1988, publishes on page 2 a 1,400 word article by V. Ogurtsov and V. Udachin entitled "Without Substitution: Notes from the Krasnodar Kray Party Conference." The report, which provides an overview of the conference's activities, is noteworthy for recounting criticism directed at Kraykom First Secretary Ivan K. Polozkov.

Following a general review of the shortcomings of local party cadres, the authors relate that: "Serious criticism was heard at the conference during the addresses of secretaries B. Kibirev, A. Dzharimov, and N. Priz. A request was made to First Secretary I. Polozkov that he show more self-restraint, patience, and thoughtfulness, especially in resolving personnel issues."

#### Afonin Addresses Kuibyshev Oblast Party Conference

18000335 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian, 28 Dec 1988, publishes on page 2 a 1,700 word article by D. Usachev and V. Abramov entitled "Long Meetings: Notes from the Kuibyshev Oblast Party Conference." As part of their synopsis of

the conference's agenda, the authors briefly summarize the address of Obkom First Secretary Venyamin G. Afonin, appointed to his current post on 30 July.

According to the report, Afonin stated that "the average annual number of new dwellings [within the oblast] is now below the level achieved during the previous Five-Year Plan, and...today's pace will not allow us to meet our obligations under the 'Housing-2000' program." The first secretary also reiterated the common complaint that builders continue to construct insufficient numbers of stores, restaurants, and recreational facilities to support the residents of new dwellings.

Turning to agriculture, Afonin was equally blunt, stating that "the agrarian sector...is not satisfying the demands of the oblast's population for food products. During the reporting period," he continued, "...the rate of agricultural production fell. Most collective and state farms have been treading water for years despite the fact that...capital expenditures are on the rise everywhere, new equipment is appearing, and more fertilizer is being provided."

#### **Gorkiy Obkom First Secretary Reviews Citizens' Complaints**

18000165 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Nov 88 p 3

[Interview with Gennadiy Maksimovich Khodyrev, first secretary of the Gorkiy Obkom, conducted by staff correspondent V. Pinigin: "Life's Hot Spots: Gorkiy Obkom First Secretary G. M. Khodyrev Reflects on 'Difficult Mail'"; interview conducted in Gorkiy; date not given]

[Text]

[Pinigin] First of all let us introduce the person with whom we are talking: Gennadiy Maksimovich Khodyrev, first secretary of the Gorkiy CPSU Obkom. He is 46 years old and took over as head of the party committee during the time of restructuring. One of his first acts was a direct television broadcast in which Khodyrev answered the questions of Gorkiy Oblast residents. After that the practice of direct broadcasts of sessions of the oblast and city soviets of people's deputies was introduced, and recently, at Khodyrev's initiative, television showed "live" an obkom plenum at which matters related to the Food Program were discussed.

How are people responding to this urge for the open discussion of pressing problems? Has the nature of the obkom's mail changed?

[Khodyrev] Yes, the content of letters is changing, and noticeably so. Previously they mainly pertained to individual cases. Today even personal problems are deeply linked with the processes that are taking place in society. Restructuring, one can say, is the leading topic. That is the standpoint from which the work of party, soviet and

economic-management agencies—including their leadership style and methods—is evaluated today. And that, I tell you, is helping us look at certain executives from an entirely different side. It is one thing when you see the raykom first secretary, say, at plenums and in trips around the rayon—in a short time you won't get to know him closely. It is another when he is being spoken of by the people who work alongside him and who, for example, personally experience his style of applying administrative pressure and his rudeness. Warning signals of this sort make us think and, of course, take action.

[Pinigin] People nowadays judge everything strictly, and quite likely they demand the same of party agencies.

[Khodyrev] Of course. Here, for example, is what war veteran A. Golov writes from the city of Lyskov: "People who have been penalized must be dismissed from their jobs and punished with the strictest penalties, not covered up with ornate formulas such as 'in connection with his transfer to other work,' and not put up for any other executive position."

Excuse me for the long quotation, but the person is clearly expressing an opinion that is not all that rare, and therefore I will finish quoting him. The veteran goes on to write: "Such people often turn out to have good patrons who can straighten out all trouble with a single phone call. Therefore, feeling a sense of impunity, such a boss lets things off all restraint and sows around him boorishness, arbitrariness and lawlessness. The people has grown tired of such 'executives.' They take what is most valuable away from a person—his belief in the purity of the intentions and deeds of a party member."

[Pinigin] It sounds harsh and, evidently, fair.

[Khodyrev] Yes, it is hard not to agree with the letter writer. Therefore, we are directing the party committees and apparatus to take a careful approach to every warning signal and deliver principled judgments. I can say that this year, in response to letters to party agencies, certain executive personnel have been dismissed from their positions after appropriate, comprehensive investigations. Thus, for example, I. Gnezdich, an excavator operator, reported abuses by B. Senkov, the executive of the Arzamas Agroindustrial Chemical Association. The letter was investigated by employees of the obkom department of agriculture and the food industry and the Arzamas Party Gorkom. The results of the investigation were discussed at a meeting of the labor collective. The association's party buro issued a strict reprimand to Senkov, and he was subsequently dismissed.

But I should admit that sometimes we really do behave liberally and then, so to speak, reap bitter fruits. For example, there were several letters about the incorrect executive methods of the first secretary of the Bolshe-murashkinskiy Party Raykom. She is a harsh woman and does not like to listen to anyone else's opinion. "I said so, and that's that!"—that is her style. A whole brigade of



obkom members went out and investigated. We hoped she would take it as a warning. No, it did not help. And then recently there was a report and election conference. At first, when the new makeup of the raykom was being chosen, she almost did not get elected and made it with the minimum number of possible votes. Then, in the election of the new first secretary a majority voted against her.

[Pinigin] Gennadiy Maksimovich, are any letters or, more precisely, the problems raised in them now getting discussed by the obkom buro?

[Khodyrev] Of course. The mail is analyzed quarterly, and notes are examined in the secretariat or buro. On the basis of some letters matters are raised as separate issues in the buro. For example, letters about the bad ecological situation in the region of the Pustinnyye Lakes in Arzamas'skiy Rayon had a great public response. The situation was already complicated, and a instrument-building association had decided to build another vacation hotel there. Members of the technical intelligentsia and students sounded the alarm. We considered the matter in the buro and then in the oblast soviet ispolkom. A decision was taken to set aside a different lot. Once a great many letters came in concerning the quality of bakery goods and shortcomings in the organization of bread sales. An important issue. It was considered in the buro and action was taken. The flow of complaints dropped off sharply.

We hold visiting sessions in connection with letters related to heat and water supply and the landscaping of city rayons. In preparing for them buro members meet with labor collectives in order to obtain as much information as possible.

[Pinigin] Nonetheless, a substantial portion of the letters—more than one-fourth—comes to the obkom via Moscow. Don't people appeal to the CPSU Central Committee and other central agencies and newspapers because, evidently, they have not been helped at the local level?

[Khodyrev] There are several reasons. First of all, of course, a perfunctory approach to the examination of letters at the local level; unfortunately, there is still a lot of bureaucratism. Some officials have one thing in mind: do anything to get rid of a matter. A person encounters a bureaucrat once or twice, and if the bureaucrat is an ispolkom official, the person has probably already formed an opinion about that body, or even about the whole Soviet regime. Where should he turn next? To Moscow. I will put it this way: There are a large number of complaints that we are forced to look into instead of the people who could have resolved a matter previously but did not want to. A simple example. A group-one disabled veteran writes. He is living on the fifth floor, the building has no elevator, and he asks to be given a comparable apartment on the first or second floor. If you take a pro forma approach, you could say: you aren't on

the waiting list, and you have no right. And that's all—the person is offended and goes to complain. On the other hand, you could show a little attention, think the matter through a bit, and give some help. It is not an insoluble problem. I think that is the sort of approach that should distinguish the party or soviet official. Put yourself in the place of the person who has appealed to you and try to find yourself in a small room with three children where it is cold and damp, and the children are sick. That is the quality that many people lack, especially on the level of the party raykoms and the rayispolkoms. I do not want to accuse everyone indiscriminately.

People nowadays see everything and compare everything. They see how energetically the Central Committee is working and how poorly local party agencies sometimes perform. And they draw conclusions. But I would say that that is also good. The main thing is that indifference has disappeared.

[Pinigin] But this comparison by no means reflects favorably on the local committees, most likely.

[Khodyrev] I understand that it does not reflect favorably on us. After all, we have all come from the period of stagnation, and some people still have their feet planted there. And apparatus employees are not without sin, either. Although, one must say that no one has been hired there on the basis of submitting an application. Usually people are chosen to serve on the party apparatus for some merits or other. And now when selecting personnel we shall, in general, rely on the opinion of the party organization from which we are taking a person. So that he is the candidate of his collective.

[Pinigin] Let's return to letters. Lately Gorkiy residents have been worried by two problems that affect the interests of the broadest strata of the population. That has been discussed in the local press, and you most likely also have letters on the subject. I have in mind the construction of a nuclear heating station and the filling of the Cheboksary Reservoir.

[Khodyrev] Yes, we do have such letters. Here is one of them. Nonna Borisovna Potanina is worried about the fate of the Makaryevo Monastery and the settlement, which will fall in the inundation zone. "These places," she writes, "are bound up with the history of the Nizhegorodskiy region. At one time the famous Makaryevo Fair was held here. The settlement has a unique school that is more than 100 years old, and it has a magnificent regional museum created by schoolchildren and residents. Is it possible that all this will be wiped off the face of the earth? Future generations will not forgive us for such destruction. We have already done a great deal of harm, as it is."

I fully share Nonna Borisovna's concern. Irreparable damage really will be done to the ancient architectural landmark and everything that surrounds it. But the Makaryevo Monastery is only a tiny part of the problems

that the filling of the reservoir will cause. Meadows and pastures will be flooded, the level of the ground water will rise in the Zarechnaya part of Gorkiy, and that will affect the operation of utility lines, etc. Therefore, in this case we side with the oblast's residents. The obkom buro and the oblispolkom have written the government a letter expressing their objections to the filling of the Cheboksary Hydroelectric Station reservoir. But no final decision has yet been made.

As for the construction of a nuclear heating plant, there are considerably more arguments about it, and they are even more heated. We have gone to the government with a request to send the project plans for expert review by the IAEA. We have received support.

[Pinigin] The debate that has developed over the nuclear plant indicates that people no longer want to tolerate having such important questions decided without their participation. It would seem that we have already been taught by the bitter experience of conflicts on these grounds. However, sometimes one gets the impression that nothing is changing.

[Khodyrev] The demand of the people that they be consulted with more concerning all vitally important questions is absolutely right. And this is not just a question of the nuclear plant, especially since construction on it was begun several years ago. There is a fresher example. You know the story that caused a sensation concerning the construction of a subway on a site in Gorkiy by the open method. The decision was made at the city and oblast level in isolation, without consulting with people. That drew a mass of letters, not just to the obkom but to higher bodies. The decision had to be rescinded. The project plans were sent to Moscow for expert review, and it turned out that the city's residents were right.

Honestly speaking, we still have a great deal to learn. Including how to discuss complex issues and how to debate. So far the party and soviet agencies are by no means always the initiators of such discussions. To the contrary, the people prompt us to do it. We set our aktiv the task of learning to lead people and foresee events, and not lag behind.

Young people, say, are making their presence felt very actively now. They are characterized, in general, by maximalism and quick tempers. Yet we must know how to candidly and persuasively answer any question they raise, no matter how controversial it might be. Many party officials are simply unprepared for that.

[Pinigin] One more question. I have repeatedly heard Gorkiy residents' unflattering comments about various special facilities—a hospital, a polyclinic, a hotel, etc. I want to cite lines from Vitaliy Fedorovich Gusev's response to an article in our newspaper, "Stories in the Thrall of Offices": "During the years of stagnation it came to be fashionable to build prestigious buildings for

party agencies on central streets and squares. In Gorkiy a huge palace sprang up on the grounds of the kremlin—it was the building of the obkom, which had not previously experienced any shortage of space. Not far from that a spacious House of Political Enlightenment was built, which is used from time to time...."

[Khodyrev] People also address such criticism to us in the obkom. I should make something clear right away: we do not have anything excessive. Discussions arise because of the lack of information, and in that respect we fall seriously short. Once a scientist asked me how many people were on the obkom apparatus. "153," I stated, "and after the reduction, 107 will remain." "Well then, I have no questions," he replied. And so, Hospital No. 3, which everyone considers a special hospital, serves more than 16,000 people. Approximately the same thing can be said about the other facilities.

Some of the premises that will be freed in the obkom building we have decided to turn over to the children's fund and the student brigades' headquarters. Proposals are also being developed as to how to use the House of Political Enlightenment more efficiently, especially in the evenings. It would be possible to hold debates, discussions of films, political battles and meetings with creative young people there. The Komsomol and the youth initiative fund could be involved in this. Mass political work is so overly formalized that it is impossible to go on any further without exploration. So let the employees of the House of Political Enlightenment think about that.

In general, to sum matters up, letters for us are a barometer of public opinion. Through them one can immediately see all our hot spots. Changes in the socioeconomic sphere and in people's thinking are taking place in a way that is by no means simple and unambiguous. This demands patient, daily work. And the letters sent to us help us choose true guidelines.

#### **Minsk Obkom Chief on Party Elections, Scaling Down Oblast Apparatus**

18000154 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian  
12-18 Nov 88 p 1

[Interview with A. A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Minsk Obkom, conducted by staff correspondent V. Voronetskiy, under the rubric "On the Course of the 19th Party Conference": "Maximum Trust—Maximum Responsibility"; first paragraph is unattributed source introduction]

A. A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Minsk Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party, answers the questions of an ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent.

[Voronetskiy] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, how is the report and election campaign going in the oblast?



[Malofeyev] Generally speaking, it is going in the spirit of the demands of the 19th Party Conference. One can note the increased civic stance of most of the Communists and their exactingness toward themselves and those around them. This is evident from the increase in the number of critical remarks and proposals. More than 110,000 of them, or one-fourth more than in previous years, have been expressed in party groups and in shop and primary party organizations. The new processes taking place in the report and election campaign can also be characterized by the following statistic: in 24 party groups the work of the party group organizers has been deemed unsatisfactory this time. In the previous elections there were only six such cases. The bureaus of 14 party organizations have received unsatisfactory evaluations, which never happened before.

[Voronetskiy] Was the competitive system put into operation during the elections?

[Malofeyev] Every party group organizer and about half of the secretaries of shop and primary party organizations have been chosen from among two or more candidates. That, of course, is still not enough. Reports and elections in shop and primary party organizations are finishing up. Rayon and city party conferences are beginning.

[Voronetskiy] That, of course, sets new tasks for the party obkom?

[Malofeyev] Unquestionably. The work of the party gorkoms and raykoms is a top concern of the obkom. Here it is important not to slip up and make mistakes. From the possible candidates who have now been named by the primary party organizations, we are trying to single out the most active fighters for changes. In examining candidates, we give preference to leading workers and collective farmers, on whom the course of restructuring will to a large extent depend. We are trying not to make the mistakes of past years. Such an approach is making it possible to follow the directives of the 19th Party Congress on democratization of the election process in the party. I think that in this connection the very content of the concept of the "nomenklatura," about which there is now a great deal of various discussion, is changing. The oblast party organization's body of personnel will henceforth be determined not by their belonging to some sort of "list," but by the unrestricted expression of Communists' will.

[Voronetskiy] What principles are you guided by in selecting candidates for the jobs of secretaries of gorkoms and raykoms? Where and how do you find progressive people? After all, there is no case in which a lathe operator or fitter from a plant has been immediately elected secretary of a party raykom. Comrades are nominated who have experience and skills in party work, and

for most of them they developed during the years of stagnation. Are all of them capable of drastically changing their psychology? How, for example, do you feel this in your own case?

[Malofeyev] Not an easy question. Such selection requires the careful study of people. And not on the basis of questionnaires, but on the basis of their actual deeds, especially in extreme circumstances. I want to note that even during the years of stagnation there were various sorts of party workers. Even then there were politically intelligent, businesslike people who were decent in all respects, but for various reasons some of them remained in the shadows. They have become one of our reserves, having grasped the ideas of restructuring and revealed themselves in the course of carrying it out. Let me note, incidentally, that even in those times the Belorussian party organization strived for a critical evaluation of what had been done, fighting against self-satisfaction and complacency.

Another reserve consists of young people who are being developed in the process of the present revolutionary transformations. In our oblast we have a majority of such people. Among the raykom and gorkom secretaries, only 11 percent have been serving for five years or more, and the rest have taken these posts since 1985. Their average age is 40. I believe that for the most part all the party raykom and gorkom first secretaries who are currently serving meet the high new requirements. They have a lot of strength and energy, and a desire to work in the new way. Their job is to master the political methods of leadership, and here the help and support of the obkom are needed. We must show them the maximum trust and demand the maximum responsibility for them, and things will go even better. As for those who are older, it is difficult to drastically change their psychology. Those will hold on who are able to do that, overcoming themselves. People see and appreciate this. As for me, I can say that I have always had to work hard.

[Voronetskiy] What qualities, in your view, should the party worker possess today?

[Malofeyev] We discussed that in detail at a recent obkom plenum devoted to personnel questions at the present stage of restructuring. I am confident that the main criterion in evaluating the party worker today is his attitude toward restructuring and the practical results achieved in the course of implementing it. That, in essence, is the touchstone, the synthesizing indicator that reflects in a single cluster the political, business and moral qualities of executives at all levels.

The requirements for the moral qualities of executives today are extremely high. People want to see in their leader a person who is not just businesslike and competent but also irreproachable in a moral sense. Cases of improper conduct on the part of certain executives and manifestations of arrogance and conceit, drunkenness,

moral unscrupulousness and greedy ways evoke a sharp and just reaction in them. I think that today, at a time of glasnost, a strong barrier will be erected against such executives.

[Voronetskiy] Do executives feel oversight on the part of the obkom in this connection?

[Malofeyev] We are making an effort to make them to feel it. We are especially concerned about manifestations of bureaucratism and a callous, insensitive attitude toward people on the part of officials. This year one in every five letters received by the party obkom has contained requests and complaints that should have been resolved at the local level but were not resolved. On the basis of people's complaints, people who have committed an offense are being held more strictly accountable, and we have been organizing checkups. We are increasing exactingness with regard not just to executives but to all Communists. In the past three years more than 3,500 people have been expelled from the party for various offenses. In the three years party penalties have been imposed on 14,806 Communists.

[Voronetskiy] What sort of reorganization is being planned in the apparatus of the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms?

[Malofeyev] In light of the decisions of the 19th Party Conference, eight departments—almost all the branch areas—are being eliminated in the obkom. So far the department of agrarian policy is being retained, and a small department of socioeconomic development is being created. Now the full burden of work and the responsibility for the advancement of restructuring and the development of democratization and glasnost lie on the department of organizational-party and personnel work and the ideological department. Within the limits of three to five people, there will be a department of legal policy, a general department, a financial and economic-management department, and a party commission. On the whole, the size of the obkom apparatus is being reduced by one-third. As for the rayon party committees and the city party committees without rayon breakdowns, their size is remaining at practically the former limits, since the main burden of work lies on the apparatus of those bodies.

In carrying out this work, we constantly keep in view its main goal, which is to enhance the political nature of the guidance carried out by the party committees, to resolutely abandon command methods, and to establish democratic principles in party and public life.

[Voronetskiy] How are social problems being solved in the oblast? Why, in your view, does Belorussia differ from other regions of the country in this regard?

[Malofeyev] I would not say that everything in our oblast is all that good; there are plenty of acute problems and difficulties. Granted, there have been changes. In two

and a half years, in comparison to the analogous period of the previous five-year period, sales through the trade network and public catering enterprises have been 35 percent greater for milk and dairy products, 36 percent greater for meat and meat products, 10 percent greater for eggs, 23 percent greater for vegetables, and 90 percent greater for fruits.

However, on the whole the supply of foodstuffs to the population cannot be deemed normal—neither from the standpoint of quality, nor from the standpoint of the variety of the assortment. It is lagging behind the ever-growing needs of our people. We must radically change the socioeconomic situation in the countryside. The main thing today is to have the lease contract adopted on all kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the near future, and to get the produce produced in the countryside to the consumer. The processing industry is still in a state of neglect.

Another acute problem is housing. In the past two years the amount of housing opened for occupancy has increased by 11 percent. But there is tremendous work ahead. We are mobilizing all our reserves. We are developing the method whereby enterprises build their own housing. In particular, by 1990 up to 19 percent of the housing is to be built by that method. The collective of the Minsk Automotive Plant is setting an example in this important undertaking. One-room apartments are being received by the plant's employees who have been on the waiting list since 1983, and two-room apartments by those who have been on the list since 1980.

The production of consumer goods is also rising in our oblast. At the present time nonspecialized enterprises are producing 65 kopecks' worth of consumer goods for every ruble in wages. That, of course, is not enough. We are trying to improve that index. At the same time, I want to say that the provision of consumer goods in the necessary assortment and of good quality remains the most acute and urgent issue.

[Voronetskiy] What is being done to improve the ecological situation within the oblast? What is the obkom's role in this connection?

[Malofeyev] It is too early to speak of any serious advances. Work in this area is developing. It is of no small importance that environmental-protection measures will now be taken into account in plans for economic and social development. Monitoring of the ecological situation is being toughened up in cities, in the zone where potassium fertilizer is mined, and in the basin of Lake Naroch. For example, in the course of 30 years of mining potassium fertilizers, a mass of burning problems has accumulated, and 400 million tons of waste lies in spoil banks alone. We are continuing to raise these issues to the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production, but it prefers to get off with

halfway measures. Environmental protection is the business of the whole people, and the obkom will hold those who forget that strictly accountable.

[Voronetskiy] Tell us, please, a little about yourself.

[Malofeyev] I am 55 years old. I was born in the family of an office employee in the Belorussian city of Gomel. As a teenager, I graduated from the railroad academy. Before being drafted into the army, I worked as a fitter in a car-repair shop. I served four years on a ship in the Red Banner Baltic Fleet. There I was admitted to the CPSU and headed the ship's Komsomol organization. After being discharged into the reserves, I returned to Gomel to my native plant. I worked there for several more years as a fitter and as secretary of the Komsomol organization. I took correspondence courses at the Belorussian State Institute of the National Economy imeni V. V. Kuybyshev. I received a degree as an economist. Then I was invited to work in the party raykom as an instructor. I graduated from the CPSU Central Committee's Higher Party School and became a professional party worker. I have covered all the rungs in the ladder. I have been secretary and first secretary of the Gomel Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party and chairman of the Gomel Oblast Soviet Ispolkom. Since March 1985 I have been first secretary of the Minsk Obkom. I am married. My wife is an instructor. We have a grown married daughter and a grandson.

[Voronetskiy] What is your attitude toward publications concerning the mass terror of the Stalin times, for example, about Kuropaty?

[Malofeyev] I believe that it is necessary to write. People should know the truth about our past. However, such facts should not be relished. They are our misfortune, a tragedy that evokes universal human pain.

[Voronetskiy] And a final question. Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, how is the subscription for newspapers and journals going in your oblast?

[Malofeyev] The subscription is proceeding vigorously. It has risen by 250,000 copies in comparison to last year. At first, until the recent USSR Council of Ministers' decision, it was impossible to satisfy the demand for many publications, including ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. Your publication has become very popular among the ideological aktiv and people of all ages and occupations in our oblast, as elsewhere. I myself read the weekly regularly and find a great deal in it that is interesting and useful in my work.

I consider ARGUMENTY I FAKTY to be a thoughtful publication, and I value that. We in the provinces have a great need for materials based on facts. After all, so many different opinions are now being expressed in the press that your head spins. It is hard for people to figure out who is closer to the truth. People believe you. Value that.

### UKSSR Officials on Elections, Mass Media, Other Issues

18000148 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
13 Oct 1988 p 1

[Article by V. Malakhov: "To Critically Assess What Has Been Accomplished. To Steadfastly Advance Perestroika: From the Plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] As has already been announced, the Plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, held on 10-11 October, discussed work being performed in the republic to implement the resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and the July and September (1988) Plenums of the CC CPSU. A report was given by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, first secretary, of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

K.I. Masik, candidate for membership of the Politburo of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee stated:

What can we learn from the resolutions of the party conference and CC CPSU Plenum? First, that there are no alternatives to perestroika. It is growing deeper and broader, and has progressed to the stage where goals of a new kind are being implemented in practice. Second, during the years of perestroika our party has been enriched theoretically and politically by the capacity to perform profound and realistic analyses of extremely complex social processes and to direct their development in the interests of socialism and of the Soviet people. Third, that today, as never before, when we are at a radical turning point in history, the responsibility of party organizations and party workers for the success of perestroika is growing. Each worker, guided by the higher interests of society, must objectively weigh his capacities and decide for himself whether he is capable of facilitating the attainment of our new goals under the conditions of today. The September Plenum of the Central Committee placed particular emphasis on this, and set an example of how and with what standards we must approach the solution of these extremely complex political problems and how our party cadres should be assigned.

The attainment of the practical goals of perestroika, he noted, has not always gone smoothly. We have encountered major and not completely foreseen problems. The people are becoming increasingly insistent in their demands for palpable results, especially those which would improve their daily lives. The necessity for staunchly breaking down the barriers hindering perestroika, avoiding all procrastination or delay, is being expressed particularly decisively at the report and election meetings currently being held.



Conditions in the labor collectives and primary party organizations of the city today are no longer what they were yesterday. Freedom, openness, controversy, pluralism of opinion—these are the true fruits of the course that has been set toward democratization and glasnost. However, the openness and directness with which we are discussing the problems that have developed, the clashing of viewpoints, unprecedented in recent decades, have shown that not everyone is capable of spontaneously and correctly understanding all aspects of every issue, or evaluating circumstances. An urgent need has arisen to explain the resolutions of the conference. And this includes sugar coupons, the "erosion" of cheap goods, and the limits on subscriptions to periodicals. All these have placed party committees and party workers in a very difficult position. We have needed and continue to need maximum restraint, competence, and of course, we must meet with people as frequently as possible, to explain to them and persuade them.

The newspapers, television, and radio cannot replace face to face communication with the people. On this matter, I want to criticize the members of the Politburo, the secretaries, the heads of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party. There is an urgent need for the leaders of the republic to have more frequent direct communication with an extensive audience of workers under informal conditions.

As for the mass media, without question, it is hard to overestimate their current role in the formation of healthy public opinion. I fully endorse the criticism expressed today in the report addressed to the party newspapers of the republic. Some of them attempt to deal with the complex, controversial issues of the day only on very rare occasions. One gets the impression that the press is simply afraid of these issues. After all, it is one thing to seek out the so-called "hot" facts and every sort of sensation; but it something much more difficult to conduct a discussion of, for example, issues of political reform, relations among ethnic groups, the function of the Ukrainian language.

In solving problems of perestroika it is very important to enhance the role of each party link. To be blunt, we seem to have ended up with a shortage of party warriors. Certain party organizations are acting sluggishly and passively, merely recording the processes occurring in the collectives. There is no question that the chief blame lies with the party gorkom and raykoms. We are attempting to reinterpret, restructure our relationships with the primary party organizations. Here we have set ourselves a two-part goal. First, to move as far as possible from guardianship, from regulating the activities of the party organizations. Secondly, to be firmer and more consistent in our attempts to strengthen party discipline.

The question of discipline and good organization is an urgent item on today's agenda. And republic agencies and their heads should set the primary example here. But this has not yet occurred. A situation has arisen which is

difficult to explain: at plenums and meetings of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, they analyze shortcomings, identify their causes, sharply and sometimes emotionally criticize the guilty, and yet the true, efficient and reliable discipline which was previously lacking is absent still. The crux of the matter seems to be that many in leadership positions have become accustomed to relying on indulgence from the heads of the Central Committee, expecting that they will reprimand us but in the end take pity on us and forgive us. This damps the ardor of people and time is running out. The success of perestroika will have to be answered for and we, the members of the Central Committee, will be the primary people who will have to answer. At the present time we fall short in dynamism and energy, daring and resolve, and especially in destroying old stereotypes and slapping the hands of the bureaucrats and paper pushers.

At all levels today, we lack the skill and political courage to self-critically and in a way worthy of our party assess the reasons for our lack of success. We still tend to look for the source of guilt at the lower levels. Officials, including those holding office at the republic level, have learned to explain everything so cleverly that they can justify any error successfully. To tell the truth even the secretaries of the party gorkom suffer from this disease. And our example is followed and the phenomenon is passed down to the the lowest levels. The people after all, require meat and milk, vegetables, clothing, shoes, and the liquidation of our notorious lines, not justifications and explanations. However, for the time being, no real progress has been made on these issues.

In Kiev, for example, trade would have to increase by a third if things are to be more or less normal. The gorispolkom deserves serious criticism on this issue. After all Kiev is the capital of the republic with its own characteristic features. There are many places, especially in the center of the city, which used to house consumer services that have been taken over by administrative offices. And yet, unfortunately, we do not have the means to show initiative and consciousness with regard to this situation or to make amends for it, at least to some degree. The officials of the republic organs are in no hurry to fulfill the enactment of the Council of Ministers. They are disbanding ministries, and eliminating thousands of positions; and plans have not yet been made to devote even a single additional square meter to meeting the urgent needs of the inhabitants of Kiev. On this matter, Comrade Ye.V. Kachalovskiy must show greater decisiveness.

The problem of strengthening party discipline in the broad sense Lenin used this term is very relevant today. It thus might be worthwhile to reexamine the draft organizational plan submitted for the consideration of the current Plenum from the point of view of strengthening the personal responsibility of communist leaders. However, under no circumstances must we allow efforts to strengthen party discipline to be accompanied by an



increase in deference to rank and servility. Today, we have more than enough commanders who demand unquestioning submission, even without this. Certain secretaries of the Central Committee, deputy Chairmen of Soviet ministries, and ministers, have failed to set a good example here through their refusal to tolerate objections and differences of opinion. Simplicity, sincerity, true party comradeship in our dealings with others—these are qualities which, unfortunately, many of us still lack.

Allow me to mention one last problem. It is related to the increased authority and responsibility of Soviet organs. Soon the legal and organizational basis of their activity will be altered. But we cannot wait for this to occur. Experience shows that new approaches must be developed now. In Kiev, they are actively engaged in developing an economic mechanism through which the Soviets and enterprises and organizations can interact at a municipal level. However, there are many problems. The absence of a clearcut system governing interactions between territorial entities and sectors of the economy continues to cause lack of balance in the development of regions, especially at a social level. The ministries and departments continue to have monopolistic control over materials and financial resources and their investment policies continue to be directed at the solution of problems of industrial production. For example, in Kiev, the proportion of outlays for nonproductive purposes has remained essentially the same for the last 3 years. It is essential that we adopt economic methods of control at a regional level in order to open up opportunities for radically increasing local budgets.

G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev party obkom emphasized in his speech that restructuring has made the public aware of a number of problems, but the most important and critical of them is the activity of the party under the current new conditions and life of the people. Today communists and non-party members are especially sensitive to the functioning of party cadres and party organizations and the development of democracy. Against the healthy background of the struggle for perestroika, one notes the attempts of individuals and groups to take advantage of the problems that occur, to put forth doubtful leaders under the flag of democratization and glasnost, and to undermine confidence in Soviet and party cadres.

The Obkom party line, developed through consultation with a wide range of Communists and non-party members during preparations for the report and election meetings, has in all ways increased in activeness, openness and cogency. At the same time, certain weaknesses are even more obvious, such as excessive tolerance (lax standards), the habit of acting only at the bidding of one's superiors, and lack of coordination of actions after decisions are made. No one will dispute the fact that the process of democratization is gaining in strength. At the same time we perceive our goal as ensuring that democracy is not replaced by its semblance, as has taken place during report and elections meetings in certain party organizations.

Frankly speaking, we are encountering problems in selecting cadres of party leaders who would be capable of attaining our new goals, who, by virtue of their deep faith in perestroika and their practical deeds are capable of uniting people and of heading the process of renewal in their work group, city, or rayon. One feels that under conditions of democratization, major changes in cadres in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, party obkoms, and lower levels right down to the primary party organizations, should concentrate mainly on searching for, gaining understanding of and selecting the workers needed. Figuratively speaking, we must create a reserve force at all levels. In our view, the Politburo, Secretariat, and Central Committee have not yet paid sufficient attention to this aspect of matters. We consider that reorganization of the party apparatus and support of the proposals of the CC CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party CC in their new structures is a responsible step in work with party cadres. We understand that the main thing is not the mechanical abolition of certain sections, but real changes in the functions and selection of workers with an outlook appropriate to today. The goal has been set—to move away from the sector principle in forming the party staff organization and to politically influence economic and social processes. The Central Committee must, on the basis of principles, develop an appropriate system of responsibility and accountability, since the well-known formula to the effect that the party obkom, gorkom and raykom are responsible for everything, erodes the responsibility of everyone else. The time has come to dispense with this sector-based accountability, lest party workers be denied the trust of the people due to the blunders of others. We anticipate this type of approach from the Politburo and Central Committee Secretariat.

We have set aside for ourselves the task of taking concrete measures to strengthen the unity between party organizations and the workers, and to implement social programs. For the time being it is very difficult to influence the solution of economic problems using political methods. The innumerable documents passed by the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers, make it seem as if everything has been taken care of; however, in practice, as is evident in the oblasts and republics, there is much that still has not been accounted for. We have had innumerable discussions on the lack of correspondence between plans on the one hand and the material and technical resources available for them on the other, and yet the situation has not altered. We are convinced that the Council of Ministers and the USSR Gosplan must pragmatically change their approach to planning. This side of things must be tightly monitored by the CC CPSU.

The directives of the party conference demand that we adopt new approaches to the agricultural industrial complex. The fate of perestroika rests with provisions. We today have been justifiably criticized for delay in adopting leasing contracts. We understand that things must be set right. But the difficulty is that today, for example, in our oblast 54 percent of the rural inhabitants are over 50, there are very few nuclear families. And for hired labor

one needs a strong back, because one essentially has to rely on his own strength. There are not enough adequately equipped small tractors or means of mechanization for family farms and fields. And yet this problem could be solved at the republic level.

Next G. I. Revenko touched on the issue of improving the political information level of party workers and activists. Because of the complexity of the political situation, he said, the secretaries of the party obkom, and other leaders must possess trustworthy information on all critical issues. They must have this knowledge so as to be able give people the right answers. They must have this knowledge so that they themselves can act if the situation arises. We consider that the local party committees must be provided with such information regularly and without delay by the CC CPSU and the Ukrainian Communist Party CC.

And there is another issue relevant to the impending legal reform. Everyone knows that tens of thousand people are "seeking justice." The majority of people who come to the reception rooms of the party obkom, have come about legal issues. These include the resolution of disputes at work, the enforcement of land and housing legislation, and many other issues. It is clearly not normal the party committees, and their staff play the role of arbitrators on every issue. We propose that such complaints be considered only in the courts. This should be the system throughout the country.

V.S. Shevchenko, member of the Politburo of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the UkSSR Supreme Soviet, noted in his talk that the September Plenum of the CC CPSU and the extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet have passed resolutions which are extremely significant for the extension of perestroika and confirmation of the sovereignty of the Soviets. The election of M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU CC, as Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has indubitably reinforced the authority of the Soviets with the authority of Lenin's party and will facilitate implementation of the course set by the 19th All-Union Party Conference with regard to delimiting the functions of party and Soviet organizations.

The restoration of the sovereignty of the Soviets confers on them great responsibility for the comprehensive development of their territories and the solution of all issues relating primarily to the people. It was thus completely logical for Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy to ask at the Plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party CC whether the Soviets of the republic were prepared to take on this difficult burden.

What can be said on this topic? First of all, the Soviets of today are not what they were a few years ago. During the years of perestroika they have been strengthened organizationally, and have acquired experience in working in

the new manner. Secondly, the development of democracy and glasnost has compelled the deputies to take a more active role, increasing their sense of responsibility to those who elected them. And this has caused the Soviets to place more reliance on groups of workers, on the populace, and to make fuller use of their initiative and interests. Third, in connection with political reform, new legal and material conditions have been created for the Soviets, which will allow them to become the true masters of their territories.

As is well known, currently draft laws are being developed concerning changes and additions to the USSR Constitution and the election of USSR peoples deputies, as well as other legislative acts. Such work is also being conducted in our republic. But edicts alone cannot restore the sovereignty of the Soviets. What is required more than anything else is a conscientious and honorable attitude to their duties, and selflessness on the part of all whom the people have entrusted with being members of the Soviet. We need a new work style and new methods, a new approach to the solution of the pressing problems with which life has presented us.

However, today far from all the Soviets are suffused with the spirit of perestroika and are moving away from inertia, and from focusing exclusively on their own needs. Here and there one still meets people who hope that someone else will decide the important issues, economic, social, ecological, and others, for them. Many Soviet ispolkoms have still not become accustomed to the democratic methods of work, and place more reliance on the ispolkom staff than on the deputies, frequently assigning the latter the role of "yes men." Now and then, the deputies make their peace with this role, but sometimes they simply adopt an indifferent and irresponsible attitude to their duties, as occurred at the session of the Zaporozhye city Soviet of People's Deputies.

On the other hand everything does not depend solely on the Soviets. It is still not uncommon that the directors of ministries and departments simply brush off their legal responsibilities, and continue to act in the old way, in thrall to narrow departmental interests. Take for example the requirement that enterprises coordinate the drafts for their plans with the local Soviets. Last year in the Zaporozhye oblast, for example, this was not done by a single enterprise of the Ministry of Construction (V.P. Salo), the Ministry of Construction Materials (A.T. Shevchenko), or the Ministry of Transportation (P.P. Volkov) of the republic.

Currently, the plan of economic and social development and the budget for the coming year are undergoing preliminary consideration by the permanent commissions of the UkSSR Supreme Soviet. And we again find that enterprises answerable to the union and republic are not coordinating their plans with the Soviets and are ignoring their proposals. And yet these proposals concern vitally important issues related to improvement of

the ecological environment, social conditions of the workers, saturation of the marketplace with industrial products and foodstuffs, and improvement of the psychological climate in the labor collectives.

To solve these and other problems, the Soviets need daily help from party committees. Experience has shown that where the party committees and Soviet ispolkoms work together in harmony, where working relationships have been established between the directors, things go significantly better. These are precisely the sort of relationships which grew up in particular, in Zhitomirsk, Ternopolsk, and Khmel'nitsk oblasts, increasing the authority and influence of the Soviets in the solution of social and economic issues. Unfortunately, not all party officials really get involved in the work of the Soviets and provide them with help. Some first secretaries of party committees rarely participate in the work of the ispolkoms to which they have been elected.

It cannot be considered desirable, for example, that in Cherkassk oblast, 33 party workers who have been elected as deputies are not members of the permanent commissions of the Soviets of People's Deputies. And yet it is precisely here, at the meetings of the ispolkoms and in the permanent committees, where the issues most relevant to the development of the regions, and the spiritual and daily lives of the people are considered. And thus it is precisely here where party principles and party support and help are needed.

Thus, in order to strengthen the authority of the party, it is completely obvious that the attitudes to the Soviets must be changed right now. First of all, we must increase what we demand of the Communists working in the Soviets and through them put the party line into effect. It is also essential to place stronger individuals in key party positions, especially in the lower level organizations, where, to be blunt, the strongest people are not always found. This can be accomplished in connection with reduction in the party organizational staff. It is critical that this be accomplished in strictest accord with party principles, so that the right individuals are actually placed in these positions, rather than jobs simply being found for those who need them.

The activity of the Soviets will become vastly more productive when we allow the masses to participate everywhere. Their monitoring, their demands, the potential for replacing inert, indifferent officials, and nonproductive deputies before their terms expire, will make the Soviets be true organs of the people's power. A major role here must be played by the press, radio, and television. This may also be facilitated by having the deputies, permanent commissions, and ispolkoms report regularly to the workers. However, some officials, even deputies of the Supreme Soviet, of the republic rarely visit the districts that elected them. And when they do go there, they are not accessible to the citizens and avoid talking with the workers, especially about acute problems which cannot be solved instantaneously.

Not long ago at a meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said V.S. Shevchenko, the Voroshilovgrad oblispolkom reported on the work of the Soviets with citizens who had appealed to them under conditions of democratization and glasnost. The chairman of the ispolkom, A.V. Kasyanov, was not very comfortable with this. Nor did I feel very comfortable as Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, since the shortcomings being discussed are also typical of Soviets of other republic oblasts.

We are disturbed that people are compelled to go to superior organs about issues which ought to be decided locally. Only last year more than 56 thousand citizens made appeals to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the UkSSR. Of these almost 25 thousand appeared in person. A total of 3.7 million workers appealed to the ispolkoms of local Soviets. As if in a mirror, they reflect where and how perestroika is progressing, where and how problems are being solved with regard to food, housing, ecology and other issues. The people demand correspondence between words and deeds and concrete changes in the social sphere. They are angered by formalism, indifference, and callousness on the part of individual officials of soviet, party and economic organs.

Of course, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the republic has not yet done everything possible to help the Soviets of People's Deputies make maximum use of the rights they have been granted in the solution of vital problems and in the search for new approaches and new forms for workers participation in the implementation of practical goals. We will draw conclusions from today's criticism and incorporate them in the work of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and its permanent commissions so as to implement the resolutions of the 19th Party Conference.

Ya. P. Pogrebnyak, candidate for membership in the Ukrainian Communist Party CC Politburo and first secretary of the Lvovsk party obkom, noted in his speech that this is a very important and responsible period for our party and for the life of our society. The process of perestroika is going on and, naturally, this is relevant to every republic, every region. We must determine the active steps which have to be taken in this direction. The route to perestroika and democratization, planned at the 19th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference is being followed. The party and social organizations of the oblast are directing their efforts at attaining the goals set out at those meetings and also at overcoming the negative phenomena that have accumulated in the oblast during recent years and their effects on social and economic development.

Issues related to the new policy with respect to party cadres and improvement of the style and methods of work by party organizations are currently being discussed with great interest at report and election party meetings. Yet, frankly, we must say that in the majority of cases the conversation ranges far beyond the brigade.



shop or production unit, or the individual work group. The most heated discussions concern issues related to confirmation of the vanguard role of communists, the role of the party.

In general, the training of cadres is naturally primarily the duty of the party organizations of the rayon, city, and oblast. However, during this responsible period, the role of heads of departments and academic institutions must not be less than that of oblast party organizations. They must influence the development of the correct points of view, and an active, task-oriented attitude to perestroika in their colleagues at their work sites. It is important that pluralism of opinions, nevertheless, proceed in a healthy direction; but these days, alas, this is not always the case.

It is natural that under conditions where the numbers of party personnel are being reduced and their functions changed, we need a new approach to local guidance of the economy. We believe that, given these changes in party activity, one of the new directions should be a comprehensive approach to the development of the oblasts. Today we are developing a comprehensive program for social and economic development of the oblast for the upcoming period, which has incorporated the opinions of the majority of our scholars and economic experts. This will allow us to influence the solution of the problems in this region with less arbitrary authority and a more scientific approach.

The speaker continued to discuss in detail the solution of economic and social problems in the oblast using new types of organization of production and labor. He made remarks critical of the chairman of the UkSSR Gosnab (State Supply Department), P.I. Mostovyy, and other heads of departments for the difficult situation with respect to supplying materials to local sites. He also spoke of the problems existing in Lvov with respect to food supply. Describing the ideological situation which is developing in the oblast, Ya. P. Pogrebnyak noted that it is not simple. We, he said, are attempting to direct it toward the perestroika of practical affairs. With respect to the situation which has developed recently we must say that, along with the natural attraction to Ukrainian culture and language, we are also encountering a malicious, rabble-rousing demagoguery, which attempts to take advantage of perestroika for its own personal or group interests, with nationalistic and extremist phenomena incited in the West by the Uniate Church. This situation requires the ideological cadres to possess knowledge,

flexibility and skill in conducting discussions, persuasiveness, and a high degree of professionalism. Unfortunately, such cadres do not exist everywhere and we are now trying to rejuvenate the ideological activists, and send more scholars and experts into the working groups and shops to do a better job of explaining the positive aspects of perestroika.

It was emphasized that today we are in a responsible stage of perestroika, a time for concrete, decisive action. We are involved in an intense struggle to create a perestroika-oriented consciousness in the masses, a struggle for the mind and heart of the people. We are aided in this by the ideological activist party members and, of course, by the mass media. And yet correspondents from certain publications, primarily national publications, do not have a sufficiently comprehensive understanding of the specific situation, and of the complex contradictory history of the land. Individual points in the article, about irregularities in the oblast, play the role of detonator, exciting public opinion and confusing our youth and students. All this does not help socialism. We must stand on principle with respect to such superficial, unsubstantiated, sensational articles. After all we are dealing here with the creation of public opinion.

Here, it is essential to say something about the blank spots in our history. Much here is pure subjectivism. People need substantiated, historically accurate, ideologically correct information and a scientific conclusion. There must be no innuendo or blurring, since distortions and biased material have begun to cause irrevocable harm, especially to the political consciousness of the population in the western oblasts of the Ukraine. It is high time for the scientific centers and the Central Committee to provide accurate material on the Communist Party of the Western Ukraine, the uniting of the western oblasts with Soviet Ukraine; there must be a document to celebrate the 50th anniversary of reuniting of the Western oblasts in the USSR.

Addressing the first secretary of the Ukrainian komsomol organization, V.I. Tsybukh, Ya. P. Pogrebnyak spoke with concern about the negative aspects of the komsomol's work. This work, he notes, is somewhat abstract, divorced from reality, from life, from the practical matters of perestroika. The youth have many discussions about their attraction to good times. The impression has been created that the komsomol workers are marked only by pragmatism, a cost accounting approach to everything, that they even compromise on ideological issues.



**New BSSR CP CC Commission to Investigate  
Repressions**

18000149a Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian  
11 Oct 88 p 3

[Interview with V.T. Golovan, chairman of the Party Control Commission attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee, conducted by Ye. Gorelik (BELTA) under the rubric "A Story Without 'Blank Spots'": "To Reinstate in the Party...."; first four paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] It is a rare publication that does not devote its pages now to stories about people whose lives were pitilessly sundered or at best crippled by a reckless wave of harsh repressions. Thousands of "enemies of the people," "spies" and "counterrevolutionaries" today have regained their good names. Very many innocently condemned people before their arrest were communists, frequently heading party committees and organizations. And each of them was hurriedly as a rule, even before a quick trial and sentence, excluded by party comrades from their ranks for that same "espionage," "subversive activity" or "ties with alien elements."

A natural question: how can culpability before the party be evaluated today of those who have already been rehabilitated by the court? Who and where examines the personal files of repressed communists? What role is played by this difficult work in renewal of public life and in the affirmation assertion of historical truth and justice?

The BELTA correspondent addressed these and other questions to V.T. Golovan, chairman of the Party Control Commission attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee. He was also entrusted with heading the Commission for Additional Study of Materials Connected with Repressions in the Period of Stalin's Personality Cult, created in June of this year, of the the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Its membership consists of V.G. Baluyev, a member of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee and chairman of the BSSR State Security Committee, I.F. Yakushev, chairman of the Belorussian CP Auditing Commission, R.P. Platonov, candidate member of the Belorussian CP Central Committee and director of the Party History Institute attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee, A.A. Zdanovich, member of the Belorussian CP Auditing Commission and chairman of the BSSR Supreme Court, G.S. Tarnavskiy, the republic's prosecuting attorney, V.I. Gnedko, deputy chairman of the Party Control Commission attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee, and V.N. Chayko, chief of a sector of the Department of Party Organizational Work of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

"The chief aim of our commission is a comprehensive study of documents and materials relating to party rehabilitation of persons who were victims of gross

injustice and despotism," V.T. Golovan states. "It can involve in participating in investigations and in the study of one or another difficult problem scientific collectives or individual specialists of the highest qualifications, ask for data from all of the republic's and country's archives and where necessary assign the conduct of additional investigations to organs of the court, procuracy and state security.

[Gorelik] Would you, Vasilii Timofeyevich, confirm this description of the commission's powers with specific examples?

[Golovan] That is not difficult. But first I must state that party rehabilitation of condemned innocent people was begun in the republic even before the special commission's creation. Concomitantly with our cases, this work on the instructions of the Belorussian CP Central Committee was conducted by the Party Control Commissions attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

One may familiarize oneself by way of a concrete example with the materials on whose basis D.F. Zhilunovich (Tioshka Gartnyy), a prominent statesmen and public figure, chairman of the first Temporary Worker-Peasant Government of Belorussia, academician of the BSSR Academy of Sciences and well-known writer, was reinstated into the party.

The commission collected many documents describing sequentially, year by year, the rich but difficult and far from definitive biography of Dmitriy Fedorovich Zhilunovich. Here are certificates relating to the first years of his life—he was born in Kopyl into a family of landless peasants. He began to work as a farm laborer, and he worked in a leather plant. In 1904, he joined the local organization of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party and actively took part in its activities—he conducted revolutionary propaganda among the peasants, disseminated literature and headed a political circle of leather workers. Then in looking for work, he walked all over Belorussia, the Ukraine, Latvia and Lithuania. He worked in Minsk, Mogilev, Poltava, Riga and other cities. In the beginning of 1913, when he was already 26 years old, he found a job in Petersburg at the Vulkan Plant—this corroborates the information from the Leningrad State Historical Archive on the registration of a "peasant from Minsk Guberniya as an apprentice milling machine operator. He actively participated in supporting the newspaper PRAVDA and was published on its pages. He attached himself for a while to the "interregionals" and joined the Belorussian National Liberation Movement, becoming one of the leaders of its leftist revolutionary democratic movement. He began to publish the newspaper DZYANNITSA with his own means.

In March 1917, D.Zhilunovich joined the Belorussian Socialist Party, a petty bourgeois national party, which held reformist-appeasement positions and supported the

Provisional Government. He represented in it the revolutionary wing and actively fought against bourgeois-nationalist tendencies, which to a considerable degree contributed to the split of this organization. Dmitriy Fedorovich subsequently said concerning his position: "I fully sympathized with the Bolsheviks, but I had not reached the realization at that time to share in the program and the tasks of the Communist Party." He did not directly participate in the October Revolution.

Post-October documents disclose one of the most crucial periods in our republic's history—attainment of its own statehood and the creation of the Communist Party of Belorussia. D. Zhilunovich was fated to find himself in the epicenter of the most important events in terms of significance and consequences. The republic paper recently described this period in detail, we shall not be repetitive. We can only say that D. Zhilunovich's contribution to the state structure of the BSSR and the creation of the Communist Party of Belorussia is hard to overestimate. He was entrusted with heading the Provisional Worker-Peasant Government created after the completion of the 6th Northwestern Conference in Smolensk, which declared itself to be the first congress of the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Belorussia. It accomplished a great deal in the month of its existence: it took confident steps toward the formation of central republic organs of state government and conducted elections of uyezd and volost soviets and uyezd and gubernia congresses of soviets on the territory of Minsk Guberniya. The fact may also be stated that as a service to the government it effectively prepared and convoked the First All-Belorussian Congress of Soviets, turning over to it all authority.

As we know, at the congress in Smolensk the Central Bureau of the CP(b)B was selected in which D. Zhilunovich and I. Lagun were included from among the Belorussian communist sections. Dmitriy Fedorovich proposed expanding the representation of sections in the bureau, but they did not agree with him.

Subsequently this position of D. Zhilunovich would be considered as hostile and nationalistic, as a desire to create a government that would not be under the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

[Gorelik] Vasily Timofeyevich, the commission thoroughly studied all the documents connected with the state and creative work of D. Zhilunovich. What else was he charged with?

[Golovan] Let us start with the most serious charge. In November 1936, he was arrested as an active member of a counterrevolutionary fascist organization allegedly operating in Minsk. After cruel interrogations and coerced confession, he became ill and died in 5 months at the Mogilev Hospital.

Late last year, the BSSR Procuracy, after a comprehensive and thorough examination, put an end to D. Zhilunovich's criminal case "for lack of a corpus delicti in his actions." No materials were found confirming the existence of a counterrevolutionary organization in Minsk.

As for party penalties, it should be said that they were pronounced repeatedly. Thus, in July 1924 in the course of the party's purge, the verifying commission of the BSSR People's Commissariat of Education, where he worked, excluded him from the ranks of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) for one year "for his isolation from the masses and petty-minded position." On the basis of an appeal in September of the same year to the Central Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks), he was reinstated into the party but received a strict reprimand with a warning against lack of self-control.

In November 1929, the commission for verifying and purging party cell personnel of the same People's Commissariat of Education excluded D. Zhilunovich from the party "for systematic expressions of views objectively directed against the party and the building of socialism and bureaucracy and for isolation from party life. Behind this statement, if it were to be evaluated from the positions of today, stood largely contrived accusations. He was faulted, for example, for the fact that on returning from an assignment abroad, he occasionally spoke positively of the organization of city management in Riga and Berlin, of the set-up of publishing in Prague, referring to its backwardness in Minsk and on the need for more active adoption of the best methods.

Kramola observed that D. Zhilunovich was trying to popularize the works of Ya. Kupala, Ya. Kolas and other authors whose works were then considered most national-democratic.

In January 1931, a resolution of the Presidium of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Belorussia excluded D. Zhilunovich from the party "for deliberately carrying out a national-opportunistic and national-democratic policy, for participating in antiparty groups, for ties with national-democratic and fascist groups alien and inimical to the cause of the proletariat and as a mouthpiece of hostile forces used for their purposes by the national-democratic counterrevolution in a struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat."

[Gorelik] There is no denying it, the statements are harsh, if not outright cruel. How, in your opinion, can this be explained?

[Golovan] Toward the end of the '20s and the beginning of the '30s, the struggle was exacerbated against the ideology of national-democratism, which was considered a counterrevolutionary movement hostile to the Soviet Power. The events of the latter were discussed intensely,

were frequently distorted, and their class content was undermined. For example, in the 30s, the fallacious opinion was asserted that the Belorussian national-liberation movement was bourgeois-nationalist in its class character, and the presence of a revolutionary-democratic direction in it was denied. Consequently all its participants were declared nationalists. Such an accusation was also leveled against D. Zhilunovich.

[Gorelik] What was proved by the investigations of the documents and analysis of the work of Tishka Gartnyy?

[Golovan] The groundlessness of many charges was established. Archive materials show, for example, that at all the congresses of Belorussian national organizations, including the congresses of the Belorussian socialist assembly, D. Zhilunovich condemned the counterrevolutionary activity of the bourgeois nationalists, fought for the separation of leftists elements from them and their consolidation on a revolutionary platform and actively upheld the program of revolutionary-democratic changes.

The party documents of the post-October period were thoroughly studied, as well as those that were formerly available to Belorussian historians and have now been received from the archives of Moscow and Leningrad. They contain no negative assessments of D. Zhilunovich's activities. At all congresses of the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Belorussia, his views and practical work as a whole were positively rated. In the accountability report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Belorussia to the 10th party congress in January 1927, it was noted that the work of T. Gartnyy "is most restrained as regards proletarian policy." It reflects the "proletarian spirit in the Belorussian national movement prior to the October Revolution."

At the same time, his work, especially in the first stage, and publications during the 20s displayed weak sides: a shallow knowledge of Lenin's theoretical heritage, a lack of permanent ties with worker collectives and the influence of the former environment of the Belorussian socialist assembly. Hence the errors, inaccurate evaluations of certain events and occurrences, wrong notions about individual questions of national and cultural construction. But without a doubt they provided no grounds to include him among deliberate enemies of the people.

The commission in good time acquainted members of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee with the objective conclusions and assessments made on the basis of an analysis of all the documents. It unanimously adopted a decision on the party and political rehabilitation of D. Zhilunovich and reinstated him in the party as of October 1918. The Party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee affirmed this resolution.

[Gorelik] In the search for truth in this case, as we became convinced, major scientific and creative people were involved. But what about the restoration of the good name of a rank-and-file communist?

[Golovan] The approach among the commission's members is the same: a decision must be preceded by the deep and comprehensive analysis of all the documents and facts. Undoubtedly their volume and complexity are different for people with different biographies and fortunes.

I shall cite such an example. We recently examined a petition by the wife of N.S. Kritskiy, a former director of a secondary school in Bykhov, with regard to his party rehabilitation. Nikanor Stepanovich was arrested 24 December 1937 on an espionage charge. On the following day, the raykom buro excluded him from the party as an enemy of the people, unmasked by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs.

On our instructions, competent organs repeatedly checked on the validity of the charge and death sentence. It was found that according to the records of state-security organs, there were no compromising materials on Kritskiy and the archive of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs also had no data on him as belonging to the secret service of bourgeois Poland. The conclusion of the chief military prosecuting attorney of the Belorussian military district states that Kritskiy was convicted without adequate proof of his guilt. This was also confirmed by the military tribunal of the Belorussian military district which rescinded the sentence of 20 January 1938.

On studying the individual and criminal case, as well as the materials relating to his rehabilitation, the commission came out for N.S. Kritskiy's restoration to the party. For adoption of a definitive decision, the materials were sent to the Mogilev Belorussian CP Obkom.

[Gorelik] You said that the case was reviewed on the petition of his wife. Is such an appeal to the commission always required?

[Golovan] Until recently, we examined cases relating to party rehabilitation only on requests and petitions. Now, on the instructions of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, personnel of the archive of the Party History Institute attached to the Belorussian CP Central Committee prepared documents on many party members subjected to repression in the years of the cult. Among them were rank-and-file communists and members of the Buro of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, party obkom and raykom secretaries, people's commissars, oblispolkom chairmen, heads of creative unions and prominent scientists. A large amount of work faces both commission members and those institutions and departments with which we shall be dealing.



And here I would like to state my sincere gratitude to the many comrades who voluntarily offered their assistance in the search for truth in the cases that we already have examined. But we understand how necessary public support will be—first of all by party veterans who were contemporaries of those subjected to repression as well as scholars, men of letters, masters of art—in the future, we shall very much count on their live testimonies and preserved documents as well as on their nobleness and disinterestedness.

[Gorelik] It is no secret, Vasily Timofeyevich, that unfortunately only a few people learned about the court rehabilitation of most of the people whose sad fates you are now studying. I have in mind the labor collectives in which they work, party organizations.... Do not such things happen even now, in the glasnost era?

[Golovan] I believe that they do not occur. In addition to communicating with relatives, we notify without fail collectives of the restoration of the good name of their party comrade. We recommend that this be introduced into the work practice of obkoms and raykoms which also were instructed to examine cases of persons subjected to repression. We hope that a method will be found in party organizations of publicly and nationally relating the truth about innocent victims or giving what is due to their bright memory so that this would find an inner response among young people and bolster their faith in the triumph of justice.

#### **Stalin Foes Syrtsov, Lominadze, Others Rehabilitated**

18300125 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by A. Kolganov, candidate of economics:  
"Those Who Were Not Silent"]

[Text] The years 1929-1930, as is well known, led to the triumph of the administrative-command system of management in our economy. It seemed that in the party there already were no leaders left capable of opposing the policy of Stalin. But by far not all agreed to follow it unreservedly. Unfortunately, the method for struggle with the recalcitrant had already been perfected—they were included among new anti-party groupings and denounced as oppositionists and double-dealers. This is precisely how the "rightist-leftist" bloc of Syrtsov-Shatskin-Lominadze came into being.

Who were these people in reality?

L. Shatskin—member of the party from May 1917. In 1919 he was elected first secretary of the Communist Youth International, delegate from the second through the fifth Comintern congresses, and in 1927—member of the Central Control Commission.

Ya. Sten—delegate of the 9th and 10th party congresses, an official of the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Communist International, a member of the Central Control Commission, a distinguished Soviet philosopher. From 1928 he occupied the post of deputy director of the Marx-Engels Institute.

V. Lominadze during 1918-1919—chairman of the Tbilisi Committee of the RKP(b), during 1922-1924—secretary of the Georgian CP, during 1925-1929—a responsible official of the Comintern, in 1930—first secretary of the Transcaucasian Kraykom of the VKP(b).

And, finally, S. Syrtsov—delegate to nine party congresses, during 1929-1930—chairman of the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars, candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee.

The fact that precisely these people proved to be opponents of Stalin is by no means accidental. Already in 1929, when with their active participation the struggle was underway with the right-wing deviation, S. Syrtsov began to record the alarming symptoms in economic policy. Being at first, together with Lominadze and Shatskin, almost the most vehement adherent of the attack on the kulak (which was clearly expressed in their speeches at the 16th Party Conference), he had the courage to revise his previous views on the path of the collectivization of the village.

On 20 February 1930, still before the publication of Stalin's article "Dizzy With Success," S. Syrtsov made a speech at the party cell of the Institute of Red Professors. He expressed sharp opposition to the acceleration of collectivization: "How do paper rates arise? They by no means arise from revolutionary enthusiasm alone. Frequently a trite optimist covers himself with enthusiasm, not bothering himself with worries about the elimination of shortcomings and preferring to look at everything through rose-colored glasses and pulling the wool over the eyes of others(. . .) You see, if you spend a long time with a peasant, if you try to convince him and to work out practical problems, the neighboring rayon, you notice, is going around you, not losing time with these "trifles." So why spend a long time with the peasant? Hint to him about the Solovki Islands, about the fact that he will be cut off from supplies, or force him to vote in accordance with the principle: "Whoever is for collectivization is for Soviet power, whoever is against collectivization is against Soviet power."

Syrtsov comes out against the mass application of exile with respect to the dekulakized, the extension of repressions to their families, against the illegal enrichment of the collectivization activists at the expense of their property. When publishing his speech in the journal BOLSHEVIK, S. Syrtsov already knew that Stalin, in his article "Dizzy With Success," placed the responsibility for the excesses on the local workers. But he does not delete from the text of his speech the direct polemic against this thesis: "We would understand the tasks of



leadership incorrectly if we would not take a tolerant attitude toward the excesses, and then would attack the local workers and hold them responsible for all the mistakes."

S. Syrtsov also called attention to the abnormally-shaped economic relations in the village. "... We must save our kolkhozes from the charms of centralization which strike out against even our more solid enterprises," he declared categorically. "Bureaucratism can become a factor of the disintegration and demoralization of the kolkhoz."

What, in his opinion, should be the basis of the economic relations with the village that has been organized in a cooperative? "Money relations will still be needed for a very long time," S. Syrtsov explains his position, "in order to carry out the principle of economic accountability in the kolkhozes as sharply as possible, a principle which has entirely justified itself in our industry."

Thereby S. Syrtsov came out directly against the transformation of the kolkhozes into pumps for wringing grain from the village, attempting to defend a normal economic accountability mechanism for agriculture. Even in the reduced form in which it existed in industry. But even such a mechanism would have been an obstacle to the shameless robbery of the village and would not have let the horrible crime take place—the famine of 1933.

S. Syrtsov's party comrades L. Shatskin and Ya. Sten, several months before this, spoke out against the dangerous trend of the thoughtless following, by a significant part of the party, of every word of the party leadership, which led to pogrom methods of criticism of any dissent. L. Shatskiy published the article "Down With the Party Philistine" on 18 June 1929 in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. What kind of Philistine is this?

"... He is devoted to the revolution, the working class and the party not out of fear, but out of conscience. He does not have a personal life, and he gives himself entirely to public work. And nevertheless, such a virtuous individual can become and frequently does become a party Philistine, even with party service behind him, hard labor and military service, if this individual is implanted with the microbe of ideological faint-heartedness."

Shatskin warned that this party "swamp" can play a decisively important role in the fate of the party. "A direct and active struggle is needed against the Philistine depravity in the party, whose founder and leader did not despise anyone as much as a Philistine," wrote Shatskin.

Very likely, this statement by Shatskin could be considered as merely the continuation of the criticism which Stalin himself subjected the "swamp" at the 15th VKP(b) Congress, having pointed at the "indifferent elements, indifferent to the questions of party tactics,

who vote with their eyes closed, who flow with the current. The presence of a great number of such elements is an evil, against which a struggle must be waged."

But Shatskin dared say about the Philistine words which I. Stalin could fully take as being aimed at him: "Any manifestation of ideological life and struggle inside the party within the limits of its general line he perceives as an improper escape."

The man who aspired to become the "Boss" perceived in the pluralism of opinions a threat to his monopoly of power. On 29 June 1929, the Central Committee adopts a decision condemning the article of L. Shatskin as directed against party cadres and against discipline in the party. However, on 26 July 1929 an article appeared in KOMSOMOLKA by Ya. Sten, expressing a protest against narrow-minded pragmatism in politics and against the disregard of Marxist theory.

Here a harsh bellow followed. In the August 1929 issue, BOLSHEVIK published an article over characteristic signatures—N. Yezhov, L. Mekhlis, and P. Pospelov. "Shatskin included in the 'swamp' the best part of the party cadres and the overwhelming majority of the party"; "Behind the loud arguments of Shatskin about Philistinism is concealed the complete disregard for iron Bolshevik discipline." The same accusations are raised against Ya. Sten, who is sowing "distrust in the collective experience of the party."

But the critical spirit in the party, especially among its young members, had not yet been trampled down to the end. In the same issue of BOLSHEVIK, in which Yezhov, Mekhlis, and Pospelov defamed Shatskin and Sten, the Komsomol official I. Bobryshev was able to publish the following words: "Instead of God—the hammer, instead of the Easter cake with the cross—an Easter cake with sickle and hammer, instead of the icon—a portrait of the leader—this is the substitution against which we must fight, these are the modernizing and god-building trends against which we must go into battle."

However, the forces did not prove to be equal. Shatskin and Sten were subjected to incomprehensible open criticism. S. Syrtsov still made an attempt to attract the attention of the delegates of the 16th Party Congress to the alarming symptoms in the economic development of the country. You read the stenographic report and you see through the prism of S. Syrtsov's speech the unhealthy points: The excessive scale of construction, calling forth the massive immobilization of capital investments and the conservation of construction projects; the lack of success in the struggle against bureaucratic ambitions, supplanting the living cause; the dissemination of fiscal optimism, and the slurring over, in accountability, of the real state of affairs in the economy.

The analysis of the economic situation soon made by S. Syrtsov as chairman of the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars led him to the conclusion that the shortcomings are not accidental: Things were not going well with the very course of economic policy. An analogous conclusion was reached by the first secretary of the Transcaucasian VKP(b) Kraykom, V. Lominadze. Their opinions in many respects were similar to the economic analysis which was undertaken earlier by N. Bukharin. Knowing that conclusions of that sort can entail devastating political appraisals, S. Syrtsov nevertheless expressed his point of view in a report on the control figures for the 1930-1931 year, and V. Lominadze—in "Appeals of the Transcaucasian VKP(b) Kraykom." And here is where they brought to light the "anti-party bloc of Syrtsov—Lominadze—Shatskin."

V. Lominadze was accused of an appeal "to narrow the front of capital construction." S. Syrtsov dared to call the practice of planning "a game with figures and the decreeing of percentages." But if we take into account that I. Stalin had insisted at the 16th Congress on absolutely unrealistic rates, intended to guarantee, by the end of the five-year plan, the extraction of 40 million tons of oil (instead of 21.7 million tons according to the plan) and the production of 17 million tons of cast iron (according to the plan—10 million), and that in the end these figures had to be repudiated, not having reached even the more modest preliminary plan figures, the position of Syrtsov appear in a different light.

"The Syrtsov—Lominadze Group" was also accused of denying the entry of the USSR into the period of socialism, whereas Stalin declared: "We have already entered the period of socialism, for the socialist sector now holds in its hands all economic levers of the entire national economy, although to the construction of the socialist society and the destruction of class differences it is still very far." The guilt of the "factionists", thus, consisted in the fact that they refused to echo the evident stupidity, which the general secretary had blurted out and which he had decided not to repeat any longer. As sheer hypocrisy also emerges the accusation of Syrtsov of the Trotskyite line on the increase of prices, since that is exactly what was realized in practice. Exactly also the words of Syrtsov about the real wage—in "this sphere there is a great deal of trouble, major, increasing"—fully corresponded to the state of affairs. Precisely in 1930 a trend was noticed toward the fall of the real wage, which distinctly advanced in 1931 and 1932.

Was Syrtsov guilty of slander in asserting that "pseudo-shockwork" and "the falsification of the industrial financial counterplan" is widely disseminated? Are these not the facts that were discussed in the decree of the VKP(b) Central Committee of 29 April 1930 and in the appeal of the VKP(b) Central Committee of 3 September 1930? The same was stated by BOLSHEVIK in 1931: "... The necessary plan and registration of its implementation does not exist in the brigades." This is also indicated by the analysis of the experience of the Construction and

Installation Trust for the Erection of the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Combine. The work of the cost accounting brigades was in essence brought to nought there.

It seems, Syrtsov had grounds to assert that "almost every positive creative idea of the working class without fail after some time receives a distortion in the for of some sort of automatism." And the conclusions that sometimes in our country "they aim to escape with only an additional effort of the workers", that a significant uneconomical, clumsy expenditure of part of the energy and forces of the working class" also were not a fruit of his imagination.

The calculation to crawl out of the difficulties through the enthusiasm of the working class was, unfortunately, one of the political purposes being persistently carried out. The Administrative command system of management, which has established the principle of the infallibility of the all-embracing instructions "from above," was not inclined to ponder the validity of decisions, but it put the economic failures that are inevitable with such voluntarism on the shoulders of the working class.

Party discipline has been increasingly reduced to the corporative solidarity of the apparatus, and anyone who suggested that truth is generated in the discussion of problems and does not descend upon the party in ready-made form from the lips of leaders, at once became transformed into a "deviationist."

As an honest communist, Syrtsov already felt the deadening breath of the administrative-command and tried to warn the party. But the reaction of the party was simple. He is fighting bureaucratism? Thus, he has taken the bait of Trotskyism! And when Syrtsov appealed: "We must be strict in carrying out the principle the calculation of production cost and the guarantee of profitability," this—by present-day standards—extremely modest suggestion was identified with the bourgeois principle of the pursuit of profit.

V. Lominadze reacted with extreme alarm to the state of affairs in agriculture in Transcaucasia, where Soviet institutions were transformed into a mechanism of robbery of the village: "The rayons and rural soviets were in the state of desertion, more often than not existing practically in the form of militia-taxation centers."

The seriously perceived call to Bolshevik self-criticism cost S. Syrtsov and his comrades dearly. The majority of the Central Committee did not support them, although the leaders of the "Right Deviation"—Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky—did not want to dissociate themselves from the newly-appeared "anti-party group," having called additional attacks upon themselves.

In violation of the Party Statute, i. e., without the convocation of the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission with the participation of all candidate members of the Central Committee, S. Syrtsov and V. Lominadze were removed from the membership of the Central Committee. S. Syrtsov was transferred to the economic apparatus to work, V. Lominadze—as a party organizer to a plant.

The demands to exclude them from the party, inspired in numerous resolutions of the local party organs, did not pass. The Central Committee did not agree to this. But soon they were overtaken by the common fate of those who tried, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the construction of barrack socialism. The whole truth about this dramatic page of our history has not yet been told.

#### **Founder of Belorussian Republic Chervyakov Rehabilitated**

18000131 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Nov 88 p 8

[Article by the Laureate of the BSSR State Prize Vladimir Mekhov: "Enjoys Recognition in Belorussian Circles...": Notes to Portrait of Aleksandr Chervyakov"]

[Text] I have heard from eyewitnesses that at the time when residents of Minsk attended the funeral of Aleksandr Grigoryevich Chervyakov, an event took place, which left the town torpid, in spite of the fact that during the summer of 1937 such situations did not cause great surprise.

...Chervyakov shot himself in his office during a break between the sessions of the Party congress of the republic. As the Minsk newspapers announced in the four-line "Chronicle" statement, he "committed suicide on personal, family grounds." However, the suicide was the Chairman of the BSSR Central Executive Committee and the authorities did not dare to bury him as a simple, private person. The coffin was left for a one-day public display in a labor union club, where thousands of city dwellers and peasants, who specially came from the countryside (at that time, very few people in Belorussia were as popular as Chervyakov), were passing by in sorrow. The flow of people started to follow the cars driving to the cemetery. And then, when the first several cars had crossed the bridge over the river with the remainder of the funeral procession stretching out for several blocks behind, the unexpected happened: a line of militiamen closed the bridge and did not allow the mourners to go further.

The funeral would start in one way and would end in another. The grief of the whole nation would be declared seditious. A well-known public figure would become a suspected person and, after several days, an 'enemy of the people'.

Yes, if the first announcement of the Chervyakov death can be read as an attempt to humiliate him and to weaken the chilling impression of the news of how he ended his life, namely, 'on personal, family grounds', implying that it was a trivial, domestic event. During the continuing sessions of the congress it was repeatedly announced that Chervyakov by 'his act of suicide, though on personal grounds, committed obviously a hostile action.' Dirt and slander started to pour. Insulting nonsense about the former Party comrade and his activities in the leadership of the republic was also reported by Vasily Fomich Sharangovich, who was at that time the first secretary of the VKP(b) Central Committee and did not know, of course, that he himself was already condemned, and that his name was entered by the Yezhov's department in the list of accused for the trial of the 'right-wing Trotskyists' being prepared.

Vasil Bykov in an article 'The Only Chance' published by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA sharply stated that in Belorussia 'the vulgar sociology, ignoring the facts, and adapting to fashionable at the different times concepts depreciate even the best historical works'. At the same time, the Minsk historian, professor A. Malashko, who, according to his statements and articles, nervous and with bewilderment perceives many aspects of the current intellectual life, thinks that the situation in this sense is quite good. In his interview with the magazine POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK, he supports his opinion by the fact that during the last decades "the names of many previously slandered and repressed public figures have returned to the historical works". The name of Chervyakov is among these names.

Indeed, 10 years ago a biographical book about Chervyakov was published in Minsk. However, when one looks through this book today, he feels sorry for its author V. Yakutov. I can imagine, how long he was harassed before the manuscript was purged of even a hint on the cause of Chervyakov's death at the age of 45. The story of all the sad circumstances, which were not, of course, family related and led to his fateful decision, had disappeared. Or, maybe an "inner editor" was holding the hand of the author?

No, the "inner one" would not overcome so efficiently. I am sure that it did not happen without a presence of a stranger's controlling eye. Such an interference took place, when we were working at the Belarusfilm studios on the documentary film "To Chervyakov...urgently...Lenin". We were warned that we must, so to speak, bypass certain moments (the documentary was filmed in 1982). Nevertheless, we did show the modest tombstone covered with leaves at the Chervyakov's grave. We intended to tell the viewers by the date of his death what was not recommended for us to do. However, somewhere at the first level of authorities approving the film, we were told to remove the tombstone. Only the leaves at the tombstone foundation remained.



It is true that the name of Chervyakov is present in the historical description of the republic's path. Only there is not his fate.

For a very, very long time the origin of the Soviet Belorussia was depicted in a soft and pleasing, though it has never been like that, and faceless way, though it had first-rate political figures. It was prohibited to mention Dmitriy Zhilunovich, known in literature as Tishka Gartnyy, a prominent Bolshevik and writer, author of the manifesto proclaiming the founding of the republic, and the head of its first revolutionary government. It was prohibited to mention Chervyakov. The fact that not to mention their names in connection with these events meant not to show fully the involvement of Lenin into formation of Belorussian socialist statehood. Without exaggeration we can consider that these people, Zhilunovich and especially Chervyakov, were for Lenin the embodiment of Belorussia...

In accordance with a decree signed by Ilyich, Chervyakov became the head of the Commissariat for Belorussian affairs (Belnatskom) at the Narkomat of nationalities, the department which was resolving a wide circle of problems stemming from the suppressed by tsarism desire of the Belorussians "to be called people" (words from the famous poem by Yanka Kupala, which were spread all over the country during the pre-revolutionary years). The former North-Western kray of the Russian Empire has not been yet officially called Belorussia, when during the days after the October revolution the Sovnarkom of the Western oblast and front was formed. It was not the right time to decide how the statehood of the land with the Belorussians being the majority of the population would look like, because except for several uyezds, the territory was occupied by the Kaiser's troops. However, a group of the people's intelligentsia at the Belnatskom was already living by the future. With enthusiasm they organized in Petrograd and Moscow publication of magazines, books, and revolutionary posters in Belorussian. They organized an energetic agitational and educational work among refugees from the Belorussian provinces, many thousand of whom were cut off from their homes by the imperialist war and were dispersed in the towns of the Central Russia. With the blessing of Lunacharskiy, they began to develop the documentation for the first Belorussian university. On the pages of DZYANNITSA (MORNING STAR), the newspaper published by the Belnatskom, they sarcastically ridiculed the bosses of the Belorussian bourgeois nationalism cringing to the occupants and claiming the right to speak on behalf of the people and even to decide their destiny. They called for the compatriots in uniforms to enlist in the Red Army being formed... When the Bolshevik conference in Smolensk declared the liberated from German occupation Belorussia an independent socialist republic, the people's commissar of education of the provisional workers' and peasants' government Chervyakov was one of the five men honored to sign the respective manifesto. This decision was not a unanimous one, which today is not anymore a secret hidden in secret

archives. It has its opponents even among the most honest and distinguished Party figures. To catch them today on erroneous words said long ago would be a worthless, unfair pastime. It is easy for us to judge and to be smart from the height of past decades and the political experience acquired by the society. Could they see the same road to go during the turbulences of that time? Therefore, it is not worth to raise the issue as it is done in Minsk by some publications, namely, why there is not a Zhilunovich Street in the city, while there is a street named for Myasnikov, who was initially against the idea of creating the BSSR? The supporter of Lenin, Aleksandr Myasnikov headed Bolshevik organizations in Belorussia on the eve of the October revolution. A son of the Armenian people, he also cannot be separated from the revolutionary history of the Belorussian people. Why should we contrast the memory of one distinguished man with that of another one? There must be in Minsk both the Zhilunovich and Myasnikov streets.

Lenin equally held in high regard those Party members, who because of the war have found themselves in Belorussia on the eve of preparing for and carrying out the revolution and, due to their actions, to a great extent were responsible for the fast establishment of the Soviet power here; and those, who were vitally connected with the Belorussian peasantry and the working class. Based on his proposal, it was originally intended to include into the leadership of the republic being created equal numbers of representatives of both groups, which would have equal rights.

The grim suspiciousness of Stalin, who headed the Narkomat of nationalities' affairs, toward the Bolsheviks-"nationals" (and not only toward Belorussian) was behind the fact that during the implementation of this idea into life, it never happened. However, when the red flag was raised over Minsk after another occupation experienced by the city, this time they were white Poles, Chervyakov, who acutely felt the desires of his own people, became the chairman of the TsIK [Central Executive Commission] of the restored SSRB (the republic was then called the Soviet Socialist Republic of Belorussia) and for several years also simultaneously its chairman of the Sovnarkom.

When a form of judicial justification of the brotherly cooperation between the Soviet Russia and the Soviet Belorussia was searched for, Lenin found it necessary to seek for his, Chervyakov's participation. The sovereign national republics emerged after the revolution within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire at that time have not yet merged into the united Soviet Union, and all kinds of formal complications were occurring in the practice of their everyday relations. In the December, 1920, Georgiy Vasilyevich Chicherin wrote Lenin a letter about how the established situation discourages the Belorussian comrades, namely, when they address Moscow authorities, they very often are refused help because they are from another State. A concrete Lenin's resolution proposing urgent measures was attached to

the Chicherin's letter. One of its articles was stating the following: "To charge Chervyakov with urgently writing a draft of detailed letter from the RKP [Russian Communist Party] Central Committee on Belorussia and from the SNK [Soviet of People's Commissars] on the same subject..." Already 2 weeks later the RSFSR and the SSRB signed a military and economic cooperation treaty, which became a milestone on the road that led to the USSR formation. Chervyakov was also the most noticeable person in the events connected the young Soviet republics merging into the red-starred Soviet Union, the united family of peoples. As a script writer for documentary cinema, I had on two occasions to look at this period in his biography. Many times I closely looked with emotion and sadness at the documentaries giving a memorable description of this stocky man with a big head and the looks of a country teacher, which is what Aleksandr Grigoryevich used to be in his youth. There he is shown at the Bolshoy Theater, in the Presidium of the congress of the Soviets, which adopted the historical for the country decision. I tried to imagine what he felt being the first to sign on behalf of Belorussia documents declaring the emergence in the world of a previously unknown association of nations.

As the chairman of the TsIK of the republic joining the Union, Chervyakov became one of the 4 chairmen of the USSR TsIK together with the chairman of the RSFSR TsIK Kalinin, chairman of the Ukrainian TsIK Petrovskiy, and the chairman of the Trans-Caucasian Federation's TsIK Narimanov. The documentary preserved one of the moments during the 15-year-long career of Aleksandr Grigoryevich in the country's supreme office of power, namely, when, representing the Soviet leadership, he receives in the mid-30's in Kremlin the credentials of the ambassador of the republican Spain fighting Fascists.

Unfortunately, for the time being one can only hypothetically discuss whether Chervyakov had a chance to meet Lenin in person, to visit him, and to talk with him, although this theme, namely, Lenin talking with Chervyakov, is being actively developed by the Belorussian artists. The artist have the right to do it because even a legend may become visible in paintings and drawings. However, if we are searching for authenticity not a single such meeting is described in the Lenin's "Biographical Chronicle" published by the IMEL [Institute of Marx-Engels-Lenin]. And, therefore, the trustworthiness of the essay "The Most Important Thing" (collection of works "We Will Our, We a New World Will Build", Politizdat, 1970) written by N. Medvedeva causes doubts in the part, where these meetings are described as real occurrences. I would not talk about this case, especially when the writer had since passed away, if not the disappointing circumstance that some later authors writing about Chervyakov started to quote the publication "The Most Important Thing" as their source of information. They would not study the archival documents used by Medvedeva (if such exist, because the essay does not have any references) but quote the essay as a document. And the

story travels from one magazine to another, while in reality it requires a careful verification... In the archival reference to Chervyakov as a member of the USSR TsIK contains remarkable words: "The only one of the old Party comrades, who knows well the Belorussian public. He is recognized in the Belorussian circles."

One should understand the words "in the Belorussian circles" as an environment of like-minded people with acute national feeling, an environment of national intelligentsia. These words recognized the valuable feature of Chervyakov, his difference, and even a definite advantage compared with other Belorussian Party members.

Indeed, it is difficult to name another person in the history of the republic, who would have a similar public position as Chervyakov had and would be as sincerely, from an organic necessity rather than in the performance of his official duty, interested in the aspects expressing the character of Belorussia and determining her spiritual uniqueness. Not only did he simply know what made the writers in Minsk happy or sad, but these were also his sadnesses and joys. Due to an undiminished curiosity rather than as a person of power he would visit, when staying in Moscow, the Belorussian artistic youth studying at the MKhAT (Moscow Academic Arts Theater), and the fact that the professional theaters and their wonderful actors started to speak the language of his people, was for him a subject of special pride. Being a fan of the Belorussian cinema, which was making its first steps, he played in the film "Forest Story", the first-born of the national fiction genre. He played in this film together with two other leaders of the republic, namely, Knorin and Adamovich. All three of them during the months of the civil war, which is the theme of the film, were organizers of the partisan movement in the occupied by the white Poles uyezds of Belorussia and agreed to play themselves in the film's episode...

How terribly this anxious and proud feeling of being the son of his native land responded to Chervyakov, when his fateful hour has come! The facts that were stressed in his reference as positive features have turned into material for accusations. "Chervyakov was the ideological inspirer and leader of the national-opportunistic deviation in the VKP(b). We have obtained documents characterizing Chervyakov as the leader of natsdem movement".

That is right, of the natsdem, that is, of the counterrevolutionary national-democratic movement. No more, no less... But can we call nationalism love toward the land where you were born, the people a small part of which you are, and the culture created by this land and people?

Nationalism is a malicious unacceptance of the "strange", animosity and suspicion of people of different origin, and narrow-mindedness and narrowness of interests. Nothing of that would be accepted by Chervyakov. Old Jewish workers in Minsk, with whom he would speak fluent Yiddish during his visits to enterprises

remember, him with warm feelings. He was often seen as an emotional viewer of the performances of the Polish theater, which existed at that time in the capital of Belorussia. When he was a young teacher in the Trokaskiy uyezd near Vilno, he became a favorite of the Lithuanian children, because in spite of the strict official prohibition he taught them in Lithuanian subjects they could not otherwise understand...

Nationalism also caused, as a rule, by an inferiority complex. Well educated, original Chervyakov did not suffer from this disease. In the barking addressed at him by the half-a-century old newspapers I found words told by one diligent Party apparatchik: "If one throws away all the fine words of which Chervyakov was a great master..." It occurred to me that Chervyakov was even accused of being able to speak well. Are not the paleness of our speeches and arguments prevailing for long years, the spreading of cheerless mumbling from a sheet of paper, and today's acute shortage of ideologists capable of stirring up and persuading the public, the results of the grim watchfulness of the "unmaskers" toward the rostral liveliness and the ability to think and to express one's thoughts in a nonstandard way.

Last year, on a summer Sunday morning I received a telephone call from Chervyakov's daughter, Sofya Aleksandrovna, with whom I got acquainted during my work on the mentioned above film:

I am calling to tell you the sad news. Galya Zhilunovich passed away. We cannot inform the Writers' Union. The telephones are not answering because of Sunday. If you can, help us...

I could not prevent myself from cursing helplessly, without addressing my anger at any particular person, before I told her that I will start to search for the right persons at their homes. For tens of years the frail, weary of her fate Galina Dmitriyevna Zhilunovich was struggling for rehabilitation of her father's honest name. The matter is that after the 20th Party congress only the writer Tishka Gartnyy was rehabilitated (I will remind that this was the literary alias of D. F. Zhilunovich). His books were published again and his name reappeared in the literature studies. However, the political figure Dmitriy Zhilunovich, who, prior to his arrest in 1936 and the subsequent loss of mind under torture, was submitted to insulting criticism up to a humiliating assignment for additional education in the "working medium" (it should be said in all fairness that the workers of the enterprise where he was sent, treated him very warmly). Anyway, the accusations of all kind of "isms" were not removed from the Zhilunovich, the communist. Again and again his daughter was addressing the authorities with puzzled questions, and again and again she was receiving answers that her persistence is senseless. Finally, in the cleansing atmosphere of changes taking place today in the country, the BSSR CP Central Committee decided to review the long-standing unjust opinion about Zhilunovich and to discuss the possibility of

his posthumous return to the Party ranks, that is, when everything his daughter dreamed about finally started to come true, the heart of Galina Dmitriyevna, which endured so much during her life, failed...

The next day I was closely observing her rested face and the faces of older women sitting near the coffin, those of Sofya Aleksandrovna and the daughter of Nikolay Matveyevich Goloded, the chairman of BSSR Sovnarkom also killed in 1937. Their childhood that seemed to be so serene and so much promising in the future, made all three of them friends. Their sufferings during youth and adulthood made them sisters.

Chervyakov's wife, Anna Ivanovna, was arrested after several weeks since her husband died. It happened in Moscow. Anna Ivanovna came here with a naive and desperate hope to disperse the dark cloud of slander. The 19th-year-old Zosya (as everybody, who knew her as a little girl, still calls her today) and Anna Ivanovna's niece, Lyusya, who was brought up in the family, for some time became drops of the sorrowful human river-line every day lining up at the infamous Butyrka with parcels and baskets intended for the prisoners. An indifferent "Wait for letter" was sounding from the small window, where the parcels were received, in response to the timid question, often a silent one asked with eyes. During these 8 years the daughter has never received a single letter, or a note from her mother, who spent them in prison and camps. Only after the war both of them were reunited in Yaroslavl, where Sofya Aleksandrovna was sent in an administrative exile.

At that time, in 1937, Sofya Aleksandrovna, a student of the Institute imeni Bauman, was immediately offered to renounce her father. She refused and was fired from the institute and Komsomol. Eventually, she adapted to the life in Yaroslavl and became quite a good dressmaker. However, in 1949 it was decided that the residence of people like her in Yaroslavl is dangerous. Her passport was again taken away and she was sent without civil rights to a far more distant exile in Kazakhstan...

At the place of one of her former schoolmates I saw recently an old photograph of the class attended by Zosya Chervyakova and Galya Zhilunovich. Several years later, a good half of this class experienced the same fate as they, the children of the "enemies of the people".

On the eve of the 19th Party conference a mass meeting took place in Minsk. Its participants angry denounced the crimes of Stalin's era. Sofya Aleksandrovna Chervyakova and Valentina Nikolayevna Belyakova-Goloded were among the first to address the participants of the meeting.

I am trying to grasp all the twists of the beautiful and bitter fate. I see again the frosty December of 1921 and Lenin in his Kremlin office. He has finished reading a letter about Belorussia. He will think about her tomorrow. He writes: "To Chervyakov...urgently..."



**Law on Freedom of Conscience, Growth of Religious Groups in Lithuania Viewed**  
*1800212a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian*  
11 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by Pyatras Anilenis: "The Lawful Requests of the Believers Are Being Satisfied"]

[Text] An ELTA correspondent asked Pyatras Anilenis, authorized representative of the Religious Affairs Council, USSR Council of Ministers, to discuss the manner in which perestroika has affected the interrelations between the church and state. P. Anilenis' reply is printed below.

Lenin's Decree concerning the separation of the church from the state, and the school system from the church, was supposed to serve as a guarantee of the freedom of conscience, both of believers and nonbelievers. But in the subsequent practice, everything did not correspond to the spirit of that decree. Religious organizations, like other areas of our life, were affected by the tragic consequences of the period of the personality cult. That period has been unambiguously characterized as a rejection of the principles of socialism, which currently are being restored. The mistakes are being corrected. A new law governing the freedom of conscience is being prepared. In all probability, the draft of that law will be presented for nationwide discussion during the current year. But even now, on the threshold of the appearance of the new laws governing freedom of conscience, much is being done in Soviet Lithuania to satisfy the lawful interests of the religious centers and religious communities, and those of the believers.

As is well known, by decision of the Klaipeda City Ispolkom, the church of the Queen of Peace, and the parish house, which had been constructed with the funds of the city's believers, were returned to them. Funds have been allocated for remodeling, so that the church can take on its original appearance. In Klaipeda a second Catholic religious community has been registered, and the bishop of Telshay has assigned it a senior priest at the request of the believers.

It was recently reported that Vilnius Cathedral and the church of Saint Kazimir are being returned for religious needs. The leadership of the Lithuanian Catholic church met with administrators of the Ministry of Culture, the Art Museum, and the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. According to a bilateral understanding, the cathedral will be turned over to the believers after the completion of the repair that has been begun there, but before 1 February 1989, and the church of Saint Kazimir will be turned over no later than 4 March 1989.

Catholics living in the new housing areas of Vilnius have requested authorization to register a religious community in the area of the Sheshkine, Virshulikes, Yustishkes, and Pashilaychyay housing areas, and to build a church there, since it is difficult for elderly believers on Sundays to get to churches located in the center of the

city. The VECHEIRNIYE NOVOSTI newspaper reported that the city ispolkom had selected a place for the construction of such a church in Pashilaychyay. The republic leadership has also recommended to the ispolkom of the Akmyanskiy Rayon soviet of people's deputies that it discuss the request made by the believers to register the religious community and to construct, from funds provided by the believers, a Catholic church in Nauyeyi-Akmyane.

Authorizations have been issued for the remodeling of the Gargzhday church, the completion of the construction of Kuchyun (Lazdiyskiy Rayon) church, and the building of an annex to the church of the Alitus city second religious community. The Vilkavishskiy Rayon ispolkom has issued an authorization to build a chapel in the courtyard of the Keturvalak church. In a number of places, the believers have been authorized to repair the chapels at cemeteries and to use them for setting up the coffin of the deceased. The executive agency of the Ignalina religious community this year ordered the construction documentation for the remodeling and construction of the church. Incidentally, an authorization for that purpose had been issued as long ago as 1979. The remodeling of the Kuzhyay (Shyaulyskiy Rayon) church will be begun. The Truskavets (Kedaynskiy Rayon) Catholic church burned down during the war years. The believers have met for religious services in an apartment building that was adapted for use for this purpose, but after more than 40 years that area has become unsuitable. The question of restoring the church that burned down during the war is being decided. Authorization has already been received to restore the Kaltinen (Shilalskiy Rayon) church that burned down this year.

During the first postwar years, a number of small religious communities did not register themselves. For purposes of correcting the errors that were made, the question of restoring certain religious communities is being resolved, or the materials for this have been submitted. A Catholic religious community has already been registered in Rilishkyay (Alitusskiy Rayon), and accommodations for it have been allocated. The believers' request concerning the registration of Catholic parishes in Shlapabyarzh (Kedaynskiy Rayon), Zhvirgzhdaychyay (Shakyayskiy Rayon), and Zhlibinay (Plungeskiy Rayon) is being satisfied. The ispolkom of the Vilkavishskiy Rayon soviet of people's deputies is considering the possibility of restoring the Catholic religious community in Zhalyeyi. On the recommendation of the bishopric, the registration of the Blindzhyakup (Prenayskiy Rayon) Catholic religious community, which actually is not in operation, is being annulled.

Approximately 150 Catholic parishes in Lithuania are served by priests coming from other locations, and therefore the enrollment at the Kaunas Spiritual Seminary has been increased—150 young men will attend its five-year classes. In the summer of 1988 all 46 young men who applied were enrolled in the spiritual school.

The Kaunas City Ispolkom is resolving the question of the expansion of the accommodations for the spiritual seminary, since there is not enough space in the dining hall or the dormitories for this number of students.

The bishops and the bishopric administrators continue to have the opportunity, if necessary, to visit the Vatican to resolve matters concerning personal appointments and other very important questions pertaining to their activities. The forthcoming visit of the chairman of the episcopal conference, Cardinal Vintsentas Sladkyavichyus, to the Vatican will, I daresay, be an important event for the entire Lithuanian Catholic church.

At meetings with the founders of the religious communities, members of the executive agencies and inspection commissions expressed requests not to ban in the rooms of the ritual-services bureau the use of religious symbols: crosses, icons, rosaries. The agencies of authority authorized this. It was recommended to the ritual-services bureau that it manufacture at cemeteries, on the basis of specifications from the believers, temporary and permanent monuments with religious symbols, to have crosses to be attached to the coffin, and, in accordance with the wishes of the believers, to depict religious symbols on the ribbons attached to wreaths.

People asked to allow ecclesiastics to visit the homes for the elderly and invalids, on the basis of an understanding with the administrators there, in order to perform religious rites in the areas set aside for that purpose, since the elderly and sick persons living in boarding homes are incapable of going to church. Despite the fact that, according to the statute that is in effect, religious associations are not authorized to perform religious rites in government areas, the agencies of authority, as an exception, have satisfied this request by believers living in homes for the elderly and invalids.

The request made by the believers to declare certain religious holidays to be days off from work was considered. Satisfying the interests of the believers of all the denominations represented in the republic is impossible, since the dates of their religious holidays do not coincide. It was proposed that the declaring of certain religious holidays to be days off from work be legalized by Ukase of the Presidium of the LiSSR.

A few individuals attempt to blame the agencies of authority for the fact that the Catholic church does not have its own publication—either a newspaper or a magazine. The leadership of the Catholic church in Lithuania has not requested the right to publish such publications. A letter dated 9 September 1987 which was sent by the bishops and the diocesan administrators of the Lithuanian Catholic church to our institution states, in particular, "The question of a religious magazine has been temporarily postponed because of a number of unclear points, but it has not been canceled and it can be renewed at any time."

Many believers and the clergy have raised the question as to whether the priests should be banned from teaching children religion, from preparing them for their first confession and first communion, and also from preparing them for confirmation. This ban does exist in the statute governing religious associations. "The instruction in dogma can be authorized only in religious schools that are open in the established procedure," paragraph 18 of the statute reads. The only persons who can teach religion to children are their parents, and those parents must teach only their own children. The institution of the empowered Religious Affairs Council has recommended including in the draft of the new law governing freedom of conscience an article that does not contain the banning of having priests teach children religion with the parents' consent. The republic's agencies of authority have supported this recommendation.

Several years ago the agencies of authority in Soviet Lithuania were the first to require ministers of the faith to pay income tax in the same procedure of representatives of other professions engaged in private practice: doctors, lawyers, and engineers. On a countrywide scale also, on an initiative recommended by our republic, a rate of 4 kopecks, instead of 25 kopecks, per kilowatt-hour for the electricity used in religious buildings went into effect, starting 1 January 1985.

The questions of the religious communities of other denominations represented in our republic are being resolved positively.

Not all the problems of church life or the interrelationships between church and state have been resolved so far. Under the conditions of the development of democracy, one can hope that other decisions that are favorable for the church and beneficial for the state and for the people will be made.

#### **Ecclesiastical Academy Is Opened in Tbilisi**

18000150a Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian  
4 Oct 88 p 6

[Article by M. Tsverava: "The Road to the Temple"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text]

#### **The Tbilisi Ecclesiastical Academy has been opened.**

Only a few years ago, few would have imagined that something like this could have been done or even been simply proposed. But today the viewpoint on many things has changed. And one of the evidences of this can be considered to be with good reason the creation in Tbilisi of a new higher educational institution—an ecclesiastical academy.

The triumphal service in Zion Cathedral last Saturday heralded this event. Henceforth 1 October 1988 will be the official birthday of the ecclesiastical academy and at

the same time the start of its first academic year. In order to understand the importance of what has happened, it is not necessary to go into any sorts of details. It was simply enough to look at those who came to the Zion Cathedral. They were by no means only believers and members of the clergy, although there were many of them. But here were writers, cinematographers and scientists.... The opening of the academy was a significant event in the cultural and public life of the republic.

The cathedral's candles were burning in a special way, festively. The triumphal service was recorded by cameramen and newspaper photographers, and they, it would seem, were quite able to do without the help of special lights and flashes because Zion Cathedral was lit up so brightly. And music could be heard that was lofty and pure. This was a real celebration. Not just a church celebration. While the opening of the academy was a significant event, in my opinion it should be considered in even broader terms no less than turning over to the Church recently of a number of churches and cathedrals formerly belonging by reason of an incomprehensible logic (in terms of today's ideas) to some other departments. This does not mean a withdrawal into religion but a recognition of its rights, more precisely a real application of freedom of religion and conscience that has always existed in the Soviet land—society reached this point today, and it is a sign of the times.

On this day a great deal was said about traditions. Following the triumphal service, a meeting was held in which members of the clergy and invited guests took part. In addresses, the thought was voiced repeatedly that the Church in the course of its history of many centuries has participated most directly in the development of society, science and culture. It is no accident that in the past all kinds of educational institutions were created in monasteries which subsequently gave to the world prominent scholars and creative, political and public figures. It is enough to just remember, for example, the Gelati or the Ikaltoyskaya academy. How many glorious pages of the history of the people are connected with them.

"But long years of our history of the 20th century. Patriarch-Catholicos of all Georgia Iliya II states, were spent on breaking down and diluting faith and learning. But is it possible to compare incommensurable things that belong to absolutely different spheres with each other. Faith involves the spiritual and science, the physical world. They, on the other hand, supplement each other. But of late, things have taken place in such a way that science has gone far ahead while spiritual perfection has remained far behind, and mankind has found itself at a dead end.

"Today is a happy day for us," the patriarch continued. "We have long dreamed of creating in Tbilisi an ecclesiastical academy, and our dream has been realized. The Tbilisi academy must become at the same time the center of spiritual and scientific life. I hope that it will have close

contacts not only with other of our higher educational institutions, and I believe that this is how it will be. I congratulate everybody on today's joyous event."

The level of instruction at the academy will be very high. It has only just been established, but the contacts concerning which the Patriarch-Catholicos of all Georgia spoke are already beginning to come into being. Lectures for the academy's first students, most of whom have a higher education, will be presented by leading scholars of the republic and professors and instructors from other VUZes.

"In the name of the administration, instructors and students of Tbilisi State University, I want to congratulate everyone on the creation in Tbilisi of an ecclesiastical academy," N. Amaglobeli, rector of Tbilisi State University, says. "I am confident that the academy will make a worthy contribution to the development of Georgian learning and culture. In the epoch of scientific and technical progress, when a multitude of powerful factors exists contributing to the leveling of man as an individual, the ecclesiastical academy and the university have many common problems, which must be admitted. And for this reason I assure you that we are ready for most close cooperation. Our professors and instructors will joyfully agree to give courses of lectures at your establishment on any disciplines. We would like to make available as much as possible of our material and technical base. In the near future, as soon as the problems connected with a move to new quarters are solved, we shall fulfill our promise without fail and turn over to the academy a number of books from the university's library. Incidentally, our contacts with religious educational institutions are not just being born now but have definite traditions. This transfer of books will be a kind of return of a loan because once a number of valuable publications were turned over to our library by the ecclesiastical seminary."

"The need for creation of an ecclesiastical academy," Archbishop Zosime, the rector of the academy, who at the same time is the rector of the ecclesiastical seminary, says "came to a head a long time ago. But, speaking candidly, when the question of its opening was directly brought up, many of us, including myself, became fearful. Would it be possible, would there be sufficient means and resources? But our patriarch believed in this and his faith was passed on to us. And now this day has arrived...."

Sometimes VUZes are figuratively referred to as "temples of learning." In regard to an ecclesiastical academy, this expression fits to perfection, for the concepts constituting it possess here not a figurative but a completely concrete interpretation. And there is no doubt that the creation of the academy is a wise step. It is for the benefit of knowledge, for the benefit of achieving harmony in society which today is paying back its debts and returning the rights which always were declared but not always, alas, granted. This road leads to the temple.



**Rayon Official Defended for Participation in Religious Funeral**  
*18000142 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 88 p 2*

[Article by A. Teplyuk: "A Funeral and a Reprimand"]

[Text] On 20 September the rayon newspaper LUCH KOMMUNIZMA (town of Bednodemyanovsk in Penza Oblast) published the short article entitled "Story of a Funeral" reproduced below.

On 19 August a funeral procession was passing down the town's central street. A coffin draped in blue cloth was being carried above the heads of the crowd of relatives, friends, and acquaintances of the deceased woman. Pupils from the eight-year school were carrying more than a dozen wreaths. The procession attracted the attention of passers-by, since some of the participants were Communists—key figures in rayon organizations.

The procession preceded the burial of citizen T.S. Gudilova, a pensioner who had been a teacher in the Bednodemyanovsk eight-year school. The funeral service was conducted in accordance with religious custom. It was organized by the deceased's husband, Communist I.Ye. Gudilov, also a pensioner and former teacher in the town's eight-year school. Walking alongside was the deceased's son, V.I. Gudilov, who was a member of the party rayon committee bureau and chairman of the rayon people's control committee who had been unsuccessful in persuading his father to change the style of the funeral.

It is a fact that there recently have been quite a few cases of Communists participating in funerals conducted along religious lines. This was possible since this did not attract undue attention, and if measures were taken, they were not made public.

The party rayon committee buro delivered a severe reprimand to CPSU member V.I. Gudilov for gross violation of the CPSU Statutes requirements and cited for participating in a funeral associated with religious rites the following CPSU members: Comrades V.A. Shpagin, A.I. Miryakhin, V.V. Sergeyev, A.V. Lazarev, A.V. Televnin, A.V. Gureyev, and V. Plaksin.

That is the situation. We phoned I.Ye. Gudilov, the husband of the deceased. Ivan Yermolayevich told us the following. His wife suffered a long and serious illness. Several days before she died, she requested that she be buried in accordance with the Orthodox custom. Now the story becomes sad. Instead of remembering all the good times they had together, Ivan Yermolayevich was supposed to subject his wife to ... antireligious work! Alas! this is so. He had some idea of the consequences. He feared not only for himself; he also feared for son Valeriy, who was chairman of the rayon people's control committee.

As a check on the buro members, let us have a look at the Statutes. It is stated there that a party member is obligated to "wage a decisive struggle against religious prejudices..." This is clearly stated. I should think that the bureau members based their decision on this line of the Statutes.

The buro is the buro, it should know that. However, since the decision was made public, let us also have something to say about the situation.

The Statutes have nothing to say about Communists having the right to be present at a deceased relative's final trip—if it occurs by way of the Church. Nor should it have something to say. The Statutes are not a collection of instructions. However, according to the logic of the article, to prevent defaming the high calling of a Communist, Valeriy Gudilov had no right to attend the funeral of his own mother, who had fed and raised him to take his place in the world. At the very time when any normal family is suffering inconsolable grief, it seems that he was supposed to persuade his father to violate the last wish of the deceased. Along the lines of the same logic, he would automatically have joined the ranks of "opium merchants for the people" if he would enter a House of God to bid his mother a final farewell. (Valeriy did not do that. He stood, the same as the group of schoolchildren, a distance of 100 meters from the church.)

However, we think that the punitive decision was not prompted by the Statutes. Or even by scrupulous application to this case. It was more a matter of a certain Bednodemyanovsk comrade (or group of comrades) who had nothing to do with the bureau. He (or they) only wait for the opportunity to giggle from the sidelines: "You of all people, a party member, yet..." We know that there are such comrades. Someone must have alerted the oblast. And someone there responded, since the matter smacked of "politics."

Yes, a Communist is obligated to "wage a decisive struggle." But using common sense, without sacrificing dignity and honor. Not to attend the funeral of one's mother is conduct that not only is ungodly, it is inhuman, and, I venture to say, uncommunist. There are no alternatives. There cannot be two funerals.

Yes, not a word about funerals is mentioned in the Statutes. Incidentally, although none of the versions of the Statutes includes a statement to the effect that the best means to combat the religious opiate are dynamite and mayhem, that is how they were interpreted. But what year do we see on the calendar?!

What a grievous error! What produces a religious fanatic or "militant atheist"? Both are ready to break heads to prove that they believe, the difference being that the fanatic wants to break his own head, while the "atheist" wants to smash someone else's.

In this story there is the consolation (if that is the word!) that LUCH KOMMUNIZMA is not distributed in the other world.

**Journalist Against Using Force on Believers;  
Backs Religious Freedom**

18000103 Moscow KOMSOMOLAKSYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 11 Oct 88 p 2

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent A. Chudakov: "I Believe in ... the Bulldozer—Why Force Is Still Being Used in Atheistic Work"]

[Text] After all his ordeals, Father Grigoriy finally set out to visit the "higher levels." Of the secular kind. Where exactly? Moscow, of course. He had already climbed the rungs of the spiritual hierarchal ladder leading to Vlydyka Yuvenaliy, archbishop of Kursk and Belgorod. Although the Vlydyka possesses high rank and great power, he could do nothing in this case, other than give Father Grigoriy his blessings for success in godly affairs. This is how the priest of one of the parishes in the Kursk-Belgorod Diocese came to visit the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial office.

At one time there were two churches in Chernyanka. One of them, the larger that was more or less the main one, was simply blown up before the war. Thus, the Church of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin became a victim of the prevailing concepts of atheistic work. Concerning the second church, the Nikolskiy, there must not have been enough dynamite to blow it up, or perhaps no one simply got around to destroying it.

By the middle of the 1980's the church building had already become dilapidated; the rusty roof had been installed by one of the last inhabitants. Inside there is complete desolation. Lathes with peeling paint which look like tanks knocked out of action lie abandoned on piles of trash and broken bricks; black earth is visible through gaping holes in the floor where boards were ripped up "to be used elsewhere."

This was the setting for the timid attempt being made by the Russian Orthodox Church, in the person of Father Grigoriy, its sole representative in Chernyanka, to try to recover property which it had owned at one time. "Return it, respected people," the father implored the rayispolkom. "Why do you need it? It is nothing but a liability. We will restore the building to its original state, and it will become an ornament of the rayon center."

Let us confess openly that it was not merely considerations of saving a church that guided the priest, of course. The church was necessary for him, quite necessary, to be used for its original purpose.

There are many religious old women. I venture to say that it is hardly necessary to wage a relentless atheistic struggle against little old women who carried on their

female shoulders the hunger of the 1930's, the terrors of the fiery maelstrom of the last war, and the restoration of a completely devastated oblast. One may say that their quiet and harmless faith may be all they have remaining in their old age. As such, attempts to destroy or take it away are inhuman and merciless. It seems that we are even changing our view on the nature of the church. We no longer picture it, as we did in the 1920's, as a beast-like priest carrying a bandit's sawed-off gun, with cartridge belts crisscrossing his chest. As a matter fact, many churches have been opened recently. Take a look at the okrug: in Staryy Oskol there are as many as six active churches; they exist in Novyy Oskol, Korocha, Valyiki. It is said that in Belgorod even a new (!) church is in the planning stage and will be erected. After having thought about all this, the church committee members set out to visit the rayispolkom.

Chernyanka Rayispolkom Chairman V.I. Litvinov was severe and implacable. "No!" crudely blurted out Viktor Ivanovich. "You oldsters have come up with a bad idea. The Soviet Government should open churches for you! As far as that goes, there already is a claim on the site: we will build a kindergarten there."

"You will build what? What about the church?" asked the old women with a gasp.

"We will tear it down, naturally."

Party Raykom First Secretary V.Z. Getmanskiy, Rayispolkom Deputy Chairman V.S. Usachev, and the other officials, as they are referred to, then seemed to set out on the final reconnaissance of the enemy before launching a major offensive. It seemed that the schedule was "tight"—the construction site, as the gently sloping hill came to be called, was to be prepared for the forthcoming work as soon as possible.

I suddenly recalled with unusual clarity of contrast a photograph of the Nikolskiy Church which Father Grigoriy kept so carefully. It showed the church as it looked originally. An ornate and delicate extremity topped by five tightly-strung cupolas rose skyward with an amazing lightness, above a plump foundation that seemed to be made of dough.

"Comrades," I said, cutting in carefully. "Perhaps this is not necessary? Bulldozers, pickaxes? A pity, quite a pity. The fact is that you are being offered complete and quality restoration of a monument of south Russian church architecture, of a ravaged beauty, at no cost to the government."

As I spoke I had the feeling that somehow I was not being understood: Placing "church interests" above the needs of small children?! I must admit that the kindergarten problem is pressing. The rayon center needs another kindergarten - badly. But why on this particular hill? Are there no other sites? Permit me the right not to understand, even though the officials tried to convince me.

Chernyanka is not New York, Moscow, or even Belgorod, where a kindergarten building cannot be erected without adversely affecting other structures. Does this mean that there are other reasons?

"It is you who does not understand, young man," I was told condescendingly. "How can a new church be opened practically on the main street? That is ideologically incorrect, even antiatheistic. There is a meetinghouse which is also located nearly in the center, on a street section slated for renewal, by the way. What are the believers to do after the meetinghouse is torn down? We will give them a lot to erect a new one. Eventually. Somewhere in the village not far from Chernyanka."

So that is how the matter lies. From the standpoint of atheistic propaganda it is incorrect to permit restoration of a monument—an active one at that—of ancient architecture, but building a new drab, gray box is all right? In addition, if we take into account the church's willingness to make up for the costs associated with replanning by providing voluntary material assistance for construction of the kindergarten at any other location, the wall erected by the rayon managers' decision comes crashing down on the basis of the economics involved.

On that frigid morning I could convince no one. For many years the oblast wanted only one thing from the managers: the plan. His majesty, the plan, which determined the rate and number of deliveries of meat, milk, beets...Mud-caked trucks. Roads in poor condition. An endless merry-go-round of sowing and harvesting requiring enormous concentration of forces from the entire rayon populace. Reports, summaries, accountings. What place is there for culture, history, monuments! All this seemed to be an attribute of another world, a distant one, a world of capitals and large cities. There were few people who could see beyond the figures and indices to notice that close at hand we have our own provincial treasures, our own art, our own culture. The gems of southern Russia are amazing if not glaring in their beauty. Such as the Nikolskiy Church or the subterranean Kholkovskiy Monastery, which was shown to me by Viktor Fedorovich Yevdokimov, chief architect of the rayon, and his son Borka.

The unique subterranean structure lies at quite a depth in the ground, winding through a chain of high hills that line the picturesque banks of the Oskol. Long, winding galleries; monks' cells; a subterranean church - all this

was hewn out of cretaceous rock in the 17th century. No wonder the eremitic monks took to the underground abode, hidden from the eyes of strangers: there was much turbulence at that time on the southern borders of Russia. According to legend, the subterranean fortress could hide regiments of warriors and herds of horses. Even earlier, according to one legend, these very hills were host to the famous meeting between Prince Igor and his brother Vsevolod before they launched their campaign against the Polovtsi.

However, the years and neglect have taken their toll. Some of the cretaceous crawl entrances are caved in partially, others completely. The moist walls of the galleries are covered with autographs scribbled by sorry tourists who wandered in. Now on the wide elevation, from where one can look out over a vast expanse of meadowland all the way to Novyy Oskol, there no longer is a windmill with its once turning sails or a wooden church. Time has relentlessly relegated it all to nonexistence. Oh, but to bring back and restore all of that! What an incomparable palette of geo-ethnographic museum and monument under the sky that would be!

Nonetheless, I think that this is not the main issue. The Nikolskiy Church, the Kholkovskiy Monastery, our monuments of culture and architecture, our customs, tales, legends, our highly distinctive folklore in general - all this should be carefully preserved, it should exist. It should exist primarily so that Borka, the light-haired Belgorod boy, can grow up to be a Russian person, full of national pride and dignity which we, to tell the truth, have squandered so foolishly.

I want to make it clear that we, convinced Marxists and materialists, will never stand for purely ecclesiastical interests or an idealistic philosophy of religion. At issue here is something else: protecting national cultural monuments, which as the historical fate of our Motherland has willed it, often became cult structures; a new level of atheistic thinking that excludes the use of force, which has often brought more defeats than victories; and, finally, protecting the constitutional right of citizens of freedom of religion.

Finally, I believe, and want very much to believe, that the time of bulldozer and dynamite atheism has passed, never to return. However, a feeling of alarm, a sensation that somewhere solar oil is being poured into the fuel tank of an enormous tracked mastodon just prior to setting off with a roar toward an abandoned and defenseless church, is something that refuses to go away.



**Chief of Filmmakers' Union Interviewed**  
*18000173 Moscow OGONEK in Russian*  
*No 44, 29 Oct-5 Nov 88 pp 30-31*

[Interview with Andrey Sergeyevich Smirnov, first secretary of the USSR Filmmakers' Union, by Konstantin Marinin; occasion, date, and place not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Not one of his pictures has reached the audience intact; each one has suffered some kind of loss or other. "We will help you change your profession," the deputy minister once promised him. And the art officials were very successful in achieving their intention. Film director Andrey Smirnov, the author of "Belorusskiy vokzal" [The Byelorussian Station] plus "Angel" [Angel] and "Osen" [Autumn], which are known today for their troubled histories, quit directing. He spent several years replacing his cinematographic specialization: leaving the film set, he settled down behind a desk. A play and several screen plays were written during these years. And then came a new turn of fate—more than 6 months ago Andrey Smirnov succeeded Elem Klimov, who went on a creative leave in connection with making a new film, to the post of first secretary of the USSR Filmmakers' Union. Everything that happens in Soviet cinematography attracts general attention today. This was the subject of the OGONEK correspondent Konstantin Marinin's conversation with Andrey Smirnov, who is acting first secretary of the USSR Filmmakers' Union.

[Marinin] Andrey Sergeyevich, 2 years have passed since the Fifth Congress of the USSR Filmmakers' Union, which was a pivotal one for our cinema. The membership of the union's secretariat was almost completely changed and in general, different people are carrying out policy in cinematography today. But the changes are not too evident—as before there are few good pictures, to say nothing of masterpieces. So what happened to the promises?

[Smirnov] We did not promise anything to anyone. The Filmmakers' Union does not shoot films, and for this reason alone cannot in any way guarantee the quality of the product. The congress sharply criticized the situation, pointed out the obstacles which have formed in our filmmaking system, and outlined goals and ways to achieve them. Our task is to analyze these obstacles. That is the first thing.

Glasnost is of course good. The atmosphere in society has changed, and it has also changed in cinema. But that is not enough. Too much remains the same. I would like everyone who is interested in this to know that today, in October 1988, nothing has changed in the production and distribution of Soviet films—the plan is the same, the performance standards are the same, the antiquated technical base is the same, the horrible film and equipment are the same, the command system is the same, the

labor payment is the same. In fact our names today cover the very same mechanism that operated happily under both Romanov and Yermash. That is the second thing.

And, finally, the third thing. Good pictures have always been made in our country. There have been too few of them, but there have been some. In Brezhnev times, despite everything, Tarkovskiy, and Loseliani, and Avrebakh made their masterpieces. There are too few good pictures even today. Talent has always been a rarity and it remains so. Planning thereproduction of talented persons is a hopeless task. But a qualitative leap is possible. Changing the conditions in which talent is manifested and forming a new generation of filmmakers, above all directors, for whom these conditions will become customary is necessary and sufficient for this leap.

[Marinin] So nothing has changed in our cinema?

[Smirnov] It has changed, but only a little. Much of what appears on the screen today is essentially the product of pre-restructuring times; the script portfolios of the studios were formed back then. A picture which for many people symbolizes the changes in our cinematography, V. Pichul's "Malenkaya Vera" [Little Vera], began production some time ago too. But it is precisely the changes which have occurred which have made it possible for this film to appear on the screen. Even 3 years ago there could have been no talk of it.

Or, let us say, the picture "Ispoved" [Confession], the debut of the young director G. Gavrilov. This documentary film about a drug addict filmed as an artistic film speaks of the problem of the lack of warmth and humanity in people's relations, an unbelievably important subject for our society.

I can mention Belorussian director Rybarev's picture "Menya zovut Arlekino" [They Call Me Arlekino]; the film "Dni zatmeniya" [Days of the Eclipse] by the Leningrader Sokurov; the film "Zerkalo dlya geroya" [Mirror for a Hero] by Khotinenko of Sverdlov; "Merzavets" [Scoundrel] by Azerbaijani filmmakers; the work "Iglu" [The Needle] from the Kazakhfilm Studio; the Mosfilm-Debyut pictures "Zashchitnik Sedov" [Defense Attorney Sedov] and "Marka" [The Brand]; and the film "Gomunkulus" [Homunculus] by Byelorussian director Karpov. As you see, there are quite a few examples of the new cinema, and, what is particularly important, their geographical distribution is fairly broad.

[Marinin] But, as far as I can judge from the names you listed, none of the well-known directors figure in this list. Of course, it is good that fresh forces are appearing in cinema. On the other hand, it is strange that the masters of our cinema seem to remain on the sidelines.

[Smirnov] A real artist is distinguished by the fact that he cannot seize the first theme that comes along, especially a "spicy" one which just yesterday was banned. A master

begins a new work after long reflection and recognizes his responsibility for what he is doing. Now when many themes have become permitted and available, they have in large part lost interest for the real artist. Genuine talent is always slightly ahead of the times. Today we need a new artistic level which corresponds to the level of freedom in our society and, moreover, raises our sights even higher. That is why many of our serious directors either have not yet made a new work, are just approaching it, or are only beginning to shoot it. For example, Aleksey German was searching for more than 2 years, but now, as far as I know, he has begun a new screen play.

[Marinin] You just mentioned themes that were "banned" until recently. But do you not have a feeling that after the censorship restrictions were removed, cinematographers as a crowd flung themselves headlong into the "spicy" subjects? Prostitutes, drug addicts, and Soviet mafiosi literally filled the screen. I am not sanctimonious and I do not want to turn things back. But certainly reflecting these ugly phenomena cannot be an end in itself.

[Smirnov] There is nothing to fear—life itself will separate the wheat from the chaff. Yes, some directors are trying to conceal a lack of talent and professionalism behind sensational material; this is sometimes simple opportunism. An example of that is the film "Vory v zakone" [Thieves in the Law]. What can be done—it is the cost of greater freedom of creativity. But I am convinced of one thing: if the process of expanding freedom continues in our society, real artistic values will still inevitably come out ahead. The audience will soon tire of the "hot" subjects, perception will quickly become deadened, and before long it will become clear to the audience itself who is exploiting the theme and who is creating art. The filmmaker can only grow along with the audience. And if the changes which are now occurring in social consciousness become irreversible, then, I am sure, in time we will get not only new cinema but also a new audience able to understand the work of the filmmakers. The same realities operate in cinema and the same distribution of forces exists as in society as a whole. And the struggle for restructuring in filmmaking is essentially part of our general struggle for a new life. The main result of the Fifth Congress of the USSR Filmmakers' Union is not who is leading the Union. The main thing is the program adopted by the congress.

We, that is, the new membership of the Governing Board of the Filmmakers' Union, are now being reproached for supposedly having taken up administrative work and for developing changes in the system and so on, rather than actually making films. Yes, that is true, but who would take this up if not us? A far-reaching document was born in the last 2 years—the plan for restructuring Soviet cinema, the so-called "base model". It deals with all fields of the filmmaker, from production to distribution. It was constructed on four very important principles:

first, public-state supervision of cinematography; second, film's independence as a sector; it envisions complete—both economic and creative—independence of newly created studios; and, finally, cost accounting. Seven months have passed since this most important document was formulated.

When the artistic leaders of the newly formed studios went to work, it was being said that the "base model" would begin to operate in the very near future and they would be able to realize the basic principles which I was just talking about. But what in fact happened? Not one of them was realized, all of them remain on paper only!

Not so very long ago we found out that the republic committees on cinematography were being eliminated everywhere under the guise of reducing the size of the apparatus. They are being placed under the wing of the local ministries of culture, even though cinematography has little in common with them in terms of structure. We sent a letter to the government and sent telegrams to the presidiums of the supreme soviets of all the Union republics stating our arguments. They did not listen to us. And so in the Ukraine an attempt was made to ban the documentary film "Stena" [The Wall] by the director Goldshteyn by decision of one of the deputy ministers of culture. We joined the struggle and there is hope that the picture will still reach the audience. But a legal question arises: what moral right does a person have, even one three-times the deputy minister, to ban a work of art?

[Marinin] But certainly someone should be responsible for an unscrupulous, low quality work, should they not?

[Smirnov] Only those who make the film—its authors and the studio which offered them the job—should be responsible. In order to hold the artist fully responsible, on the one hand he must be granted freedom of creativity and, on the other, he must be taught a sense of responsibility for what he brings to his fellow-citizens. We believe that all pictures should be put on the screen, and only then does society have the right to evaluate them. And that should happen openly. If some department does not like something in a certain film, let the offended department take the authors to court, which should make the decision to remove the picture from the screen and either impose the appropriate sanctions on the creators or exact compensation for the damages determined by law. But by law! In other words, our cinema, like the entire society, should operate on a legal basis! Meanwhile the command-administrative system of management of filmmaking continues to flourish locally. For example, there is the situation with the documentary film "Takaya dolgaya zima" [Such a Long Winter] by the director Kuznetsov which was filmed at Krasnoyarsk Studio. This is a picture about a Krasnoyarsk construction worker, one of those whom we now call "bremen of restructuring". The film was shown to the delegates of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. It represented our

documentary cinema at several festivals, but a resident of Krasnoyarsk cannot see this picture because the Krasnoyarsk Kray Party Committee does not like the picture.

Or take, for example, the so-called Irkutsk story, which in my opinion is disgraceful. T. Zyryanova, a member of our union, spoke at the April plenum of the Filmmakers' Union on the interrelations of film and television and told of the serious situation which had developed at Irkutsk Teleradio because of the leadership's command style. It was a fact that this organization had a certification commission which did not contain a single creative worker. Administrators and people in charge of lighting effects evaluated the professional fitness of the directors and cameramen. As a result of this certification, only two of the eight cinematographers with diplomas remained at the studio. The plenum sent a telegram to USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]. And soon we were informed that cameraman V. Skakun, an employee of the Irkutsk committee, had killed himself after not being certified. Gosteleradio and our union sent a commission to Irkutsk. As a result, we participated along with the collegium of USSR Gosteleradio in adopting a decision on the inadvisability of using V. Komarov in the post of chairman of the Irkutsk teleradio committee. But the Irkutsk Obkom stood up in force in his defense. We appealed to the CPSU Central Committee and in the summer conducted a traveling meeting of the secretariat of the Filmmakers' Union. A talk was held with the secretary of the Irkutsk Party Obkom Ivanitskiy. We left and after a short time found out that the only result of this action was a party reprimand of the film director Korzhanovskiy, who had openly opposed V. Komarov's line. And V. Komarov himself is working happily in that same post to this day.

[Marinin] You mentioned your union's relations with USSR Gosteleradio. Eldar Ryazanov, one of the union's secretaries, published an article in OGONEK, and the journal's readers then reacted sharply to your disagreements with the Gosteleradio leadership. Since then there has been a plenum of the Filmmakers' Union devoted to this question. Havethere been any changes?

[Smirnov] The plenum was held, and the problems remain. The Gosteleradio leadership treated our undertaking with a great deal of suspicion, but a conversation took place. A number of extremely important proposals were introduced which could fundamentally change the face of our television broadcasting. We proposed dividing it up into at least two competing organizations so that the audience can choose and evaluate the work of each one. The need to bring creative workers—filmmakers, writers, and composers—into the collegium of Gosteleradio was discussed. A document was prepared which defines the program of our rapprochement and cooperation. Half a year has passed since then and with my hand on my heart I can say that we were deceived. Nothing has changed on television and in some respects

it has gotten even worse. The collegium of USSR Gosteleradio continues to consist of officials, and as before there is not even one creative worker. As before obedient people continue to occupy key posts: V. Kononykhin still heads the film editorial office and understanding the position of this editorial office is impossible. E. Ryazanov left "Kinopanorama," but new people arrived, and they are still complaining that the directors of "Kinopanorama" mercilessly cut the material filmed without reckoning with the authors and only put what is authorized on the air. In short, despite the polite assurances of the deputy chairman of USSR Gosteleradio Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko, the situation has not changed in the least.

[Marinin] One gets the impression that the Filmmakers' Union's relations with certain party and state departments are not shaping up well.

[Smirnov] That is not true. We have completely business-like relations with the CPSU Central Committee Department of Culture. We believe that like-minded people work there. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is also helping us.

[Marinin] Our filmmakers' trips abroad—that is a special topic. It is no secret that in our country a trip abroad is a privilege of the bosses, at best a prize, an incentive. I have had occasion to hear that the present leaders of the union are the new "untouchables," who spend all their time abroad. Incidentally, that is only one side of the coin. People are saying that you usurped the filmmaking process in the country and the right to film is now being offered exclusively to people whom the new bosses like.

[Smirnov] The congress demanded that we rid our film of the stream of mediocrity. But, after all, behind every poor untalented film are the people who made it. With the introduction in cinema of the "new model" and the transition to full cost accounting, they face a real danger of losing their jobs. If the new studios become completely independent as planned, they will choose the people to conclude contracts with—Govorukhin, whose name guarantees a profit, or German, whose film can lay claim to a festival prize. But, after all, there are people, and many of them, who are incapable of either commerce or high art. They inevitably face either changing professions within filmmaking or leaving film altogether. Our union is now developing ways to resolve this problem and does not plan to cast any of these people to the winds of fate.

Naturally, they express disagreement and try in every way to resist the impending changes. That is where the talk of offering work to people "who are liked" and of the new "untouchables" comes from. But in fact a natural thing is happening: the artistic leaders chosen at the new studios did not come empty-handed but with fully defined programs of action, and it is also natural that they have offered work to people capable of realizing these programs. But even here the system will be a



democratic one—after a certain amount of time all of them will report to the public and in this way be accountable for the results of the work of the studios they head.

As for trips abroad, in my opinion that is in general a ridiculous claim. The circle of filmmakers who go abroad has grown immeasurably. With us the principle on this question is simple: the best Soviet films should be sent abroad and they should be presented by their creators. All the information on trips abroad is available to any member of the union; it is posted on the third floor of our building.

[Marinin] Is it so, then, that there can be no complaints against the new secretariat of the Filmmakers' Union?

[Smirnov] What do you mean? Many members of our union are in my opinion making justifiable complaints regarding combining posts. After the congress several creative workers joined the collegium of Goskino at our suggestion. But they are secretaries of the union. Some of them were chosen by the artistic managers of the new studios. They are Sergey Solovyev, Valentin Chernykh, Rolan Bykov, and Igor Geleyn. In the initial stage that was a justified and practical step, but now the situation has changed and the question of the division of posts is on the agenda. It will most likely be established in the new charter—so that the situation which one director described, for example, does not take shape. Before, he said, I could lodge a complaint against the artistic management in the union or at Goskino. But now I have Bykov at the studio, Bykov in the union, and Bykov again at Goskino!

[Marinin] Tell us what happened in Belorussia, Andrey Sergeyevich.

[Smirnov] Two documentary pictures which are clearly distinguished by a common background were made at the Belorussian studio. I am speaking of the film by the director Lukyanchikov "Bol" [Pain], which tells about the wives and mothers of our boys who died in Afghanistan, and the picture by the director Ruderman "Teatr vremeni glasnosti i perestroiki" [Theater of the Times of Glasnost and Restructuring], which examines the present processes of retardation in the original genre of documentary satire. Strange as it seems, neither of these films found support from either the directors of the studio or some of the leadership of the Belorussian Filmmakers' Union. Essentially, the leaders of the union and the studio tried to apply the old, prohibitory methods to these films. Our positions in this case diverged sharply.

[Marinin] And what is the situation like now at VGIIK [All-Union State Institute of Cinematography]? As far as I understand, the students there had a serious confrontation with the administration of the institute and the faculty.

[Smirnov] The situation at VGIIK is critical. A rigid and very inflexible system which in actual fact insured only the tranquility and convenience of the teachers became established there during the period of stagnation. Immediately after the congress we tried to intervene somehow, but they did not listen to us. A new rector was chosen at VGIIK—Novikov, who had worked there as prorector. On the whole everything is going on as before. Our commission on film education analyzed the group of directors who graduated from VGIIK in the last 10 years. Of the slightly more than 140 names, we counted 16 which were familiar to us at all, and of those only 6 could be spoken of seriously. That is an unprecedentedly low efficiency factor. And that is natural if we consider that in their first 2 years students in the film directing department work on skills 4 hours a week, while two or three times as much time is allotted to the social disciplines. In short, all the structures of VGIIK need to be changed fundamentally, and although the new rector is trying to do something, it is only cosmetic.

[Marinin] Recently some press organs have lodged complaints against your union. How do you regard these articles?

[Smirnov] We have no tribune. The question of a cinema newspaper is one of the key points of the decisions of our union's Fifth Congress—and it is just hanging in the air. A weekly supplement in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA does not solve the problems. And meanwhile materials are appearing in the press which are selected very tentatively. We do not consider ourselves innocent. We are not afraid of criticism and we listen to it, but we do not consider it mandatory to answer on every occasion. We regularly conduct written questionnaires and surveys of filmmakers in order to know if our colleagues support us. The last survey clearly showed that most filmmakers share our positions on all the main problems. The trouble is not that we are being criticized. The trouble is that the only alternative which resounds in this criticism is a return to the old times, or, more likely, the desire to preserve the guaranteed wage and the command system of leadership inevitably tied to it.

The Filmmakers' Union is a social organization of the intelligentsia which actively participates in the restructuring of society, trying to act on a legal basis. The possibility that some urgent problems of the day will require legal initiatives from us, that is, appeals to higher-ranking organizations regarding outdated laws and codes and the like, is not ruled out.

[Marinin] From everything that has been said, one gets a feeling of hopelessness about our cinema. It is as if you are fighting windmills.

[Smirnov] The struggle for restructuring, which involves the interests of a multitude of people and various social strata, is going on in society. Restructuring certainly has real supporters but just as many real opponents. Many of them still have a fair amount of power in their hands.

But we are not youngsters and we do not expect that as if by magic all our dreams will be fulfilled tomorrow. The struggle is going on and we are participating in it and taking fully defined positions. Of course, it is a pity that in real life we encounter open resistance to many of our undertakings. If our basic proposals are thwarted, we will leave—the entire body of the secretariat will send in their resignations before our time in office has run out. However, we have reason for optimism. Our documentary films today have brought a new hero to the screen. He is the man of restructuring. A man with a mind and a soul, high morals, and an accurate view of the life surrounding him. And if these people exist in real life right beside us, how can we surrender?!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

**Filmmakers Union Secretary Eldar Ryazanov  
Interviewed**

18110007a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in  
Ukrainian 1 Oct 88 p 4

[Interview with Eldar Ryazanov, secretary of Board of USSR Union of Cinematographers, in Odessa, by O. Halyas and O. Milkus: "What Can We Expect From Eldar Ryazanov? Interview At Your Request"; date of interview not specified; first and last paragraphs are RADYANSKA UKRAYINA introduction and commentary]

[Text] It is not easy to arrange an interview with Eldar Ryazanov. If he is not making a film, he is working on a screenplay or writing a book, or.... But this cinema director, one of the country's most popular, always has plenty of pressing matters. He even came to the vacation spot of Odessa to work, as head of the panel of judges for the "Golden Duke" film epic festival. For this reason, when we phoned Ryazanov, we were prepared in advance to be turned down—he is a busy man. But the director immediately gave us a specific interview time, warning us in advance, to be true, that he would not be able to give us more than 30 minutes. At the designated time we knocked on the door of his hotel room....

• • •

[Question] Eldar Aleksandrovich, quite frankly we were somewhat surprised by your kindness. Are you always so nice to journalists, or were we simply lucky?

[Ryazanov] Perhaps in the past I would have turned down an interview, saying that I was too busy (incidentally, a quite valid reason). Up until recently I considered journalists to be representatives of the world's second oldest profession, and my attitude toward reporters was in keeping with this. And your colleagues gave plenty of reason for such an attitude. When I would open up a newspaper and read: "Sinister Journey," I would immediately know that the article dealt with a visit by the U.S. secretary of state to Italy or England. And when I saw a headline reading "Goodwill Mission," this of course

meant that our minister of foreign affairs had traveled to Bulgaria or Czechoslovakia. You could simply ignore the text of an article. Certain clichés existed in our press, which formed the stock in trade of the majority of journalists.

But recently my attitude toward the journalist profession has changed radically—our press has become so frank, outspoken and incisive. Nowadays I simply cannot go to bed earlier than 2 a.m.: I want to be able to read at least the most interesting items. And I am entirely in agreement with a phrase which has recently become so popular: "Nowadays reading is much more interesting than living."

[Question] Is that not the reason why you are more and more frequently taking up the pen of public affairs commentary?

[Ryazanov] Today every individual should make a maximum effort to help our country extricate itself from the hole in which it was stuck during the so-called period of "stagnation." And for that reason even persons who frequently avoided civic-minded activity now are experiencing a feeling of responsibility for our country's destiny....

Throughout my entire adult life I have endeavored to keep my distance from presidiums, to avoid spending time on various meetings, commissions, etc. If I helped somebody obtain an apartment or get admitted into a better hospital, I did this, so to speak, as an individual-basis public-spirited gesture.

And now here I am, secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Cinematographers, and I took this step in full awareness of what I was doing, for I finally saw a genuine possibility of bringing benefit to my field of endeavor and to a cause to which I am committed.

[Question] You are quite correctly considered to be one of the "champions of perestroika." But does it not seem strange to you that those who are fighting for perestroika are primarily those who have no real power: journalists, writers, people of the theater, and cinematographers...? Can a destroying blow be dealt against the bureaucracy with a dozen, even a hundred articles, books and films about that bureaucracy?

[Ryazanov] Unfortunately it cannot. I say this on the basis of my own experience. Back during the period of "thaw," in 1956, I produced a film titled "Carnival Night," one of the characters in which was an idiot in charge of administering culture. The film was very successful, received excellent press reviews, and the name of bureaucrat Ogurtsov became widely known.... But all subsequent events persuasively convinced me that my characterization had exerted no effect on the Soviet bureaucracy: this bureaucracy was developing and evolving according to its own mechanisms, totally ignoring artistic works.

[Question] Must one really acknowledge that art is powerless? Take, for example, the Union of Cinematographers. How tempestuous the 5th Congress was, what splendid thoughts, ideas, and appeals resounded from the speaker's stand! But two years have now gone by, and where are they, the real results of cinematographic perestroika?

[Ryazanov] In the past a utilitarian view of art was forced on us by Stalin, who was of the opinion that each artistic work should bring certain benefit, and quite concrete, specific benefit, while those phenomena of art which do not bring such benefit, such as Akhmatova's poetry, for example, simply have no right to existence.

Unfortunately we have become accustomed to thinking within the framework of a system of clichés. If the struggle between the progressive and the reactionary continues, then the progressive must emerge victorious as quickly as possible. But wait a second.... This is not the way things usually are in real life! One example of this is the present situation in cinematography. The Union of Cinematographers does not possess any real administrative authority; it can only shape public opinion, influencing the course of events with the assistance of this public opinion. For this reason the new model of the cinematographer still awaits its confirmation in the halls of administrative authority. Even the copyright law drafted by the Union is being considered, examined, and scrutinized somewhere. Unfortunately those well-known mechanisms of bureaucratic obstruction are still functioning.

We must be realists: it is impossible to replace all bureaucrats instantly and immediately. In addition, one must consider the general situation currently prevailing in this country. A great many people, predominantly of the older generation, frequently experience something akin to shock when they read the newspapers and magazines, for only now are they finding out that things in our country are not a continuous triumphal advance, that there have been tragic pages in our history, and there have been genuine crimes and evil deeds.... These people are emotionally unable to come to terms with this new knowledge. But should they be criticized for this? For the very meaning of their lives is being denied and negated. Up until recently they could state in justification: yes, sacrifices have occurred on our journey, sometimes unwarranted sacrifices, but we were building Magnitka and Dneproges! And now we learn that if events had developed differently we perhaps could have built 20 Dneprogeses. And perhaps this should not have been done at all? Today's ecological situation is simply frightful. But you know better than I do what is happening in the Ukraine, to the rivers, seas, and environment....

[Question] May we ask a delicate question? Is your civic activeness not beginning to hinder your artistic creativity? Your recent writings have evoked considerable criticism of lack of artistic content and quality....

[Ryazanov] My films, in spite of all their shortcomings, are viewed by millions of moviegoers, and that is the main thing.

Criticism does not bother me, for I receive a vast number of letters from moviegoers. Every new picture brings as many as 5,000 responses, while every TV piece generates up to 800 letters. The TV series on Vysotskiy generated so much mail that I did not even attempt to count the letters. Therefore I am well familiar with viewers' reaction to my pictures. I only regret that I must be the sole sociologist of my own films.

[Question] We also regret that we do not always have reliable information on the fate of your films. For example, we have heard that you exported to Israel the film "Forgotten Melody for Flute."

[Ryazanov] In recent years that country has begun purchasing our films directly through Sovetskoyefilm. The Israelis also purchased "Forgotten Melody...." I was invited to present the film. Moviegoers gave us a very warm reception; one senses great interest in our country. Even the questions they asked me were questions which might have been asked in Moscow or Odessa: "How have your relations with television been since the article in OGONEK?" "When will you be returning to Central Television?"

[Question] We are sure that these same questions would be of even greater interest to our readers....

[Ryazanov] At the present time I see no prospects for collaboration with television, particularly following the public statement by Gosteleradio chief Aksenov, who publicly stated that he would not permit "pernicious Ryazanov mishmash" on the TV screen. I should state that discipline in television is no worse than in the military: if they say "You've got to cut it out," the director obediently reaches for the scissors....

[Question] It would be strange if we failed to ask you about your future artistic plans. What should we expect from director Ryazanov?

[Ryazanov] For the present I can only state that I have the definite intention to make a movie of Vladimir Voynovich's novel "The Life and Amazing Adventures of Soldier Ivan Chonkin." The screenplay has already been written and has been approved by the studio. But for the time being it is gathering dust at Goskino. The fact is that the author was expelled from the Union of Writers precisely for this work, and he was subsequently forced to emigrate.... But I hope to carry this project to completion....

\*\*\*

In recent years Eldar Ryazanov has treated us to surprises with increasing frequency. The sarcastic "Garage," the refined "Cruel Ballad," the grotesque



"Forgotten Melody for Flute," and the keen, incisive "Dear Yelena Sergeyevna".... What will be this director's next work? Even he himself is presently unable to answer this question. Only one thing is obvious: one can always expect surprises from Ryazanov....

**Aymatov on Plans for Foreign Literature Journal**  
18000084a Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in  
Russian 21 Sep 88 p 7

[Interview with Chingiz Aymatov, chief editor of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA: "What Do You Have?"; date and place not specified]

[Text] In response to readers' requests, we are continuing our cycle of interviews with the chief editors of literary journals. Today LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's correspondent converses with Chingiz Aymatov, chief editor of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA.

[Correspondent] Chingiz Torekulovich, let me start by asking a question which you, as the new editor of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA, may not particularly like. As we know, last year there was an unprecedented jump in subscriptions to a number of the "thick" journals. For example, the circulation of NOVYY MIR, DRUZHBA NARODOV, and ZNAMYA rose sharply, while INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA lost 16 percent of its subscribers. What do you think is the cause?

[Aymatov] Of course, a simple way to answer your question is by saying that our journal has been in a deliberately unfavorable position, in that while subscriptions to the vast majority of periodicals has been virtually open, INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA remained one of four limited journals. Thus, the amount of 400,000 copies (the present circulation) is certainly lower and does not reflect true demand.

We also must not ignore the fact that the "internal topic" has become much more interesting than the "international" one. The "thick" journals have started to publish works which had been on the forbidden list for many years, books that present the heretofore withheld bitter truth about our domestic history. As such, why should we be surprised if V. Grossman's "Life and Fate," A. Tvardovskiy's "By Right of Memory," or V. Dudintsev's "White Clothing" rouse keener response among readers than, say, historical novels written by the American G. Vidal?

At the same time, I would not like to limit myself to purely objective reasoning. The primary cause of the well-known loss in the traditionally high reputation enjoyed by INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA is the incipient spiritual perestroika's overwhelming appearance on the scene.

The narrow criteria applied to progressiveness in fiction have come face-to-face with criteria of general human values, which I believe must be put in first place not only

in politics, but also in ideology. In my opinion, the dictatorship of the "class approach" tended for many years to restrict, impoverish, and degrade us, not only in the sense of creativity per se, but also in our ability to perceive and reproduce the surrounding literary world in its entirety and diversity of trends via the written word. In this connection, attempts to maintain definite ideological and geographic orientation were not conducive to an artistic level of the works that were published. As a result, global criteria used in evaluating cultural values—moral loftiness, humanism, consummate aestheticism, genuine social conscience in creative work instead of political vulgarization—all this assumed secondary importance, edged out by contrived preferences. Many outstanding books, both of the contemporary variety and those which have entered the realm of 20th century world classics, were not included in the journal. Even in this light, however, I cannot say that no discoveries have been published in the journal in the last few years. There could have been more of them. I am speaking mainly of trends that caused alarm. I speak of them with a taste of bitterness, as a long-time reader and admirer of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA.

[Correspondent] But you are no longer a mere reader and admirer. You are now the chief editor. How do you intend to rectify the situation and maintain competitiveness?

[Aymatov] The situation has already started to improve somewhat this year; we must keep it up. Next year's first issue will start with a book which many say is the "novel of the century"—J. Joyce's "Ulysses." Since it is extremely long, publication will be spaced over a full year. We know Sartre mainly as a dramatist, but journal readers will be able to enjoy "La Nausee," his most important work of prose. Other top works of the year I can cite are G. Greene's novel "Monseigneur Quixote," in which there is an intense dialogue between the idea of Christianity and that of communism; "Daniel Martin"—in my opinion the major work of Englishman J. Fowles, who is known to our readers via his story "The Black Wooden Tower"; and "The Rock Which Was Christ," by the late Venezuelan prosaist M. Otero Silva. I would like to call special attention to "Temple of the Golden Pavilion" by Yu. Mishima, a remarkable Japanese prosaist, whose books were amazingly not made available to our readers.

Growing interest is being exhibited in the legacy of V. Nabokov. While the Soviet public is acquainted with him solely through his Russian language works, Nabokov is also a first-rate master of English writing. Next year we will publish his novel "Pnin."

I hope that readers will be receptive to the plays "Death of Lenin" by F. Braun and T. Ruzhevich's "The Trap" (about the early years of Franz Kafka). I want to make special mention of "General of a Dead Army," by the Albanian writer I. Kadare. In addition to introducing a

brilliant writer, this will bring back Albanian literature to our cultural environment after a long interruption, in the person of a literary artist who is known to readers in many countries.

Relative to the journal's poetry section, I would like to point out two works in progress. One is a large selection of poetry by French poet St. John Perse—thought by connoisseurs to be a major poet of the 20th century, and V. Khodasevich's translations of Boudelaire.

[Correspondent] There presently is, understandably, exceptional interest in social and political journalism and in documentary prose. Will you venture to compete with other journals in this arena, also?

[Aymatov] At least we will try. We intend to publish as early as late this year "Confession"—a book that is amazing in its naked truth, written by Czech political figure and publicist A. London, who was victimized by Stalinist repressions, which as we know overtook not only our countrymen. Although I will not hazard to guess what public reaction will be, while reading the book I suffered the same pain one feels while reading factual information relating to the tragic fates of Bukharin, Vavilov, Mandelstam, and others. Now about plans for the near future. Due to the great surge in interest in Soviet history, the time has come to take up the fate and biography of L. Trotskiy. The difficulty here, considering the sea of foreign literature devoted to this truly demonic "acute-angled" individual, is finding the more creditable evidence. I hope history specialists will help us cope with this problem. Works nearly ready for publication I can cite include American dramatist A. Miller's autobiographic "Timebends"; "Made in Japan," memoirs by A. Morita, president of Japan's Sony Corporation; "John Lennon: 1940-1980" (a biography of the leader of the Beatles quartet written by R. Connolly); and chapters from the new autobiography of I. Bergman, the famous film director.

Since we have mentioned social and political journalism, let me say that we have created the new section "Resonans." Here we will publish more or less extensive essays devoted to problems on which even we are having lively discussions. Thus, A. Camus' philosophical essay "Reflections on the Guillotine" has been translated. We also will print deliberations by foreign cultural writers relating to the social and literary climate in our country. We all have long known that things viewed from a distance look different when viewed up close. There will be room for information on important events taking place in fiction in foreign countries, in addition to various controversial topics. The new section will be staffed by a young team, and I have confidence in the journalistic skills and responsiveness of young colleagues.

Incidentally, I am obligated to say that the editors' plans do run a risk of "taking on a life of their own." Not only has the circulation been artificially frozen, but journal

copies are distributed in some kind of "apportionment" manner. Observations made over many years have shown that the vast majority of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA readers is concentrated in large cultural centers of the country. This should serve as a basis for operation. However, as we determined by corresponding with SOYUZPECHAT, Moscow subscriptions have fallen off by 38 percent (!) compared to last year.

[Correspondent] You said in a past interview that INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA will become a kind of representative of the Issyk-Kul Forum and that an international editorial council will be organized. This is a very serious initiative. How do you think this will be made a reality?

[Aymatov] The Issyk-Kul Forum and the journal are inspired by a single idea of uniting the world's humanitarian intelligentsia. This being so, their union will constitute a natural complementarity. Definite links will be worked out in the sessions and work of the Issyk-Kul Forum. Concerning the council, we will raise the international prestige of the journal by inviting major writers to participate. At the same time, formation of this organization is not merely a symbolic gesture. We expect that our writer colleagues of various continents will contribute definite advice relative to publishing of works, topics, criticism, etc.

We also intend to hold annual council sessions in Moscow, in which there will be discussions of pressing world social and literary problems, not only of routine aspects of editorial activity. In a word, there will be continuity and strengthening of dialogue.

#### **Writers Union Voices Support for Stalin Victims Memorial**

*18000084b Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Sep 88 p 7*

[Unattributed report: "In the Board Secretariat of the USSR Writers Union"]

[Text] A routine session of the board secretariat of the USSR Writers Union, presided over by USSR Writers Union First Secretary V. Karpov, was held on 12 September.

The secretariat approved a proposal made by the Soviet public and writers relative to erecting in Moscow a memorial to victims of repression occurring during the years of the personality cult, as supported by the 19th CPSU Conference, and it instructed the USSR Writers Union Production and Finance Department to deposit into account number 700454 of the USSR Zhilsotsbank the sum of 100,000 rubles as a fund for construction of the memorial.

The secretariat heard a report read by M. Dudin, president of the All-Union Committee for the Literary Legacy of A.A. Akhmatova and USSR Writers Union board chairman, relative to preparing to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the poet's birth.

The secretariat expressed agreement with the conclusions reached by the committee concerning discrepancies between the VKP(b) Central Committee decree of 14 August 1946, The Journals ZVEZDA and LENIN-GRAD, and the principles of party policy in the areas of ideology, literature, and art, as formulated in the CPSU Central Committee documents after the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress, and the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Also discussed was the USSR Literary Fund. It was decided to organize the RSFSR Literary Fund at the RSFSR Writers Union, in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree of 14 February 1987, Improvement of Activities of Creative Unions, and the RSFSR Council of Ministers decree of 22 March 1988, Formation of the Literary Fund and the All-Union Fiction Information Bureau of the RSFSR Writers Union.

Participating in the session were: Yu. Verchenko, G. Baklanov, S. Mikhalkov, Yu. Bondarev, N. Gorbachev, A. Mikhaylov, K. Vanshenkin, I. Strelkova, E. Zimin, K. Skvortsov, V. Khokhlov, Yu. Voronin, S. Mager, V. Marchenko, V. Sidorov, G. Semenov, and V. Povolnyev.



**Call for 'Lawyers Union' Renewed**  
*18000152 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian*  
11 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by V. Vlasikhin, candidate of juridical science, chairman of the group on political and legal problems at the Institute on USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Cinderella Without the Good Fairy, The Union of Soviet Lawyers Revisited"]

[Text] I remember when our legal profession was figuratively called the Cinderella in the family of Soviet legal institutions in one of the newspaper publications.

The comparison, although it is not new, is very, very accurate. The thing is, the current state of affairs in the legal profession (despite the fact that its status would appear to be constitutionally secured) is so unfranchised and without prestige, that it is essentially deprived of the opportunity to carry out normally its most important protective function. And it is no coincidence that nowhere in the world among the developed nations is there such a ridiculously low proportion of lawyers "per capita", as there is in our nation: we have 12 times fewer lawyers than are in the United States for example.

Meanwhile the question about the social level of our legal profession—its rights and prestige—has by no means arisen because of somebody's whim or for the sake of appearances: it is in its own way an indicator of the embodiment of the ideas of a state based on law and order. The thing is for today there are so insignificantly few lawyers and functionally they are pushed aside to the periphery of the legal system,—people requiring legal aid, more often than not, do not see the lawyer as a reliable assistant. And this is precisely why they do not turn to a lawyer as unceremoniously as they do to a physician, although, as we know, the value of freedom, a good name, the citizen's dignity, and his right to a defense with regard to his dwelling and property, his work interests, and consumer rights are equally as important as his health. Why then do the majority of people pass up the qualified advice of the lawyer in a legal advice office, while relying more upon the advice of "intelligent people" and upon their own experience and "personal contacts"? This happens not only because of a lack of development in legal consciousness (after all we engage in self healing only rarely and it, as a rule, is to no avail), but most of all because there are simply too few lawyers and they are overloaded to the utmost. In addition to this, their scanty prosecution abilities, which were formed during the years of the administrative command system's heyday, only cause most people to smile ironically.

Thus, the population is virtually deprived of adequate legal service—both in scope and in substance. Of course, in order to change the situation we will have to solve many pressing problems in the plan for creating a state based on law and order. This includes the question concerning the admittance of a public defender at the very early stages of a preliminary investigation, and the

possibility of including lawyers in administrative arguments between citizens, and what material and technical equipment should be provided to the bar, and the appropriate payment for services, and removing impediments to increasing the lawyer corps... But the main thing is that a citizen of a state based on law and order in any situation which is legally embarrassing to him (an eviction or argument over an apartment, an unfair dismissal from his job, all the more in an arrest or detention by the organs for protecting law and order or in inciting criminal acts) must have the opportunity to appeal to a lawyer for assistance freely and without delay. It is only in films "from life abroad" that we see scenes in which the suspect calmly and confidently says to the police: "I will not make any statements whatsoever without the presence of a lawyer". And this is a rudimentary right. And until a universal rule is approved—every individual must regulate his own action and word according to the law—the juridical guarantee of citizens' rights will remain a pretty phrase, and the idea of a state based on law and order—a declaratory wish.

All of this is more or less self-evident, at least to most lawyers. And it must be noted that much of the aforementioned is already "being looked into" and will be gradually resolved in the course of legal reform. But the legal profession has one pressing problem, which can and should be solved immediately, as a guarantee of unity in word and deed. I have in mind the creation of a union (association) of Soviet lawyers.

The question of this type of All-Union public association of lawyers has already been raised and discussed with participation by the mass media. However the matter has not budged, although it is clearer than clear that such a union is necessary simply for sending representatives of the Bar to higher levels of administration, for participation in legislative process, and for recruiting the most experienced jurists for the construction of the socialist state based on law and order. This is true, and how in the world can a state which is truly based on law and order be created, if the opinions of the legal profession are not taken into account?

Approximately 110 countries of the world are represented in the international directory of lawyers' organizations, which was published in 1983. All of them have lawyers' unions: more than half of the 600 thousand lawyers in the USA belong to the American Lawyers' Association; in the diminutive principality of Liechtenstein—of the 25 existing lawyers, 23 have joined the national association; even in Barbados there is a lawyers' association. But there is not even a mention of our vast state in the directory: we are the sole country which does not have such a nationwide association, our lawyers are scattered among various bars and disunited. And that is precisely why their voice isn't heard, especially in the legislative process.

The founding of a union of Soviet lawyers is a step which on the whole is quite simple. But at the present time, it may, perhaps, be the most important step for the deserved prestige of this profession.

One cannot help but recall that the 19th Party Conference in the resolution "On legal reform" called the legal profession a "self-governing association". However, in fact, it is governed by the Department of the Bar in the Ministry of Justice and it is namely this department which, as usual, is keeping its Cinderella in the back seat.

Moreover, the ministry has qualified the initiative of the Bars to create their own union as... unlawful activities. I am not exaggerating. I am repeating its opinion verbatim. In a letter dated 5 August 1988 from the Department of the Bar in the USSR Ministry of Justice, which was addressed to the chairmen of the presidiums of the bars in Primorskiy and Khabarovskiy krais and in Sverdlovskaya and Omskaya oblasts, it was stated in black and white, that the ministry, in conference with scholars and practitioners, is preparing the reorganization of the agencies of the legal profession itself,—and therefore "any kind of organizational measures to create a lawyers' union... are illegal".

As is well-known, in the story the good fairy rewards Cinderella for her labor in the end. I would not like to think that in real life, the self-loving stepmother would remain omnipotent for ever and ever.

V. Vlasikhin,  
Candidate of juridical sciences,  
Chairman of the group on political and legal problems,  
Institute on the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of  
Sciences

### Role of Komsomol, Political Clubs Debated

18000201 [Editorial Report] Moscow DOMESTIC TELEVISION SERVICE in Russian at 0630 GMT on 29 October 88 showed representatives of young people's political clubs and other speakers debating the present state of the Komsomol, what it should be like in the future, and the role of political clubs. The video showed the meeting being chaired by officials on a platform, but most of the contributions came from members of the audience in the hall. Most speakers were identified by caption.

Yevgeniy Palenko, a student from Poltava, said: "We propose, first, that a Komsomol program, separate from the party program, should be drawn up, since we have common aims with the party but different ways of attaining them." A man who said he represented an inter-club Komsomol group comprising Komsomol members from a number of informal Moscow associations read out a proposal from the group: "We believe that the main causes of the chronic crisis of the Komsomol are the inflexibility of its organizational structure, the absence of competitiveness and of a choice of a model for our activities, the absence of purposeful and constructive criticism, based on glasnost, of the league's leadership by organized opposition inside the league, the absence of a long-term political program, the absence of autonomy for local Komsomol organizations, and the absence of the right to experiment with the structure and forms of our activity." He went on

to say that the Komsomol should adopt a "political program," and that it was a "disgrace" that it did not have its own program. He added that the Komsomol should be granted the "freedom to set up factions and groups" and that action groups dissenting from the official league line should be able to publicize their views, draw up an "election platform" and "nominate and give their backing to candidates for elective bodies," as well as act "autonomously" to set up their own "experimental forms of work."

Moscow lecturer Vladimir Lysenko said: "I think that the Komsomol should stop imitating the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." He said that the only party influence on the Komsomol should be through "communists working in the Komsomol." "No other channels of influence on the Komsomol should exist." He said Komsomol members should be "free to leave the Komsomol without any consequences." Noting the People's Front organizations being set up in "Estonia, Latvia, and the Transcaucasus," Lysenko said grassroots Komsomol organizations and the political clubs should "play a most active part in this movement." "If we now lose the initiative, we may never be able to regain it."

An unidentified member of the audience stood up and said: "The surprising thing is that we talked long and enthusiastically about the law on glasnost, but then we have this decree on demonstrations appearing for some reason." Aleksandr Gorodnichenko, Komsomol rayon committee secretary from Kishinev, proposed that the Komsomol rules be changed to remove the stipulations that "the Komsomol committees function under the direct leadership of the relevant party committees" and that "secretaries of rayon, city, and higher committees are required to be members of the CPSU."

Aleksandr Shubin of the Moscow regional council of the Federation of Socialist Organizations and Clubs, described as a guest of the conference, said that by its "centralized" structure the Komsomol can only exert influence through "its deputies in the Supreme Soviet" who "quite happily" adopt decrees. "Decrees are not laws—have no fear, citizens. Certain people have already had experience of these non-laws to their personal cost. And after they did time, it has turned out that they were not guilty." "We are forgetting about another decree that has also been adopted—the decree on special troops—which is like a cobblestone smashing into the computer of even our imperfect legal system." "And if Comrade Mironenko wants to demonstrate that he has not become completely bureaucratized, he should be doing his utmost to fight for the repeal of these decrees even now, because at this moment people continue to be prosecuted on the basis of these unconstitutional and unlawful decrees." Shubin went on to say that he doubted if Komsomol deputies would put up a struggle, because they were elected under the mechanisms devised in the "period of stagnation and before." The majority of political clubs were not registered. "They are afraid of them, and they are not registering them." As a result, the

clubs could not nominate deputies. He said his Federation, which he called "one of the largest all-union informal political organizations," was not registered and would not be registered in the near future. Shubin's comments resulted in an uproar and a call for Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, to speak.

Mironenko replied to remarks that Shubin had made about the need for federalization in the Komsomol, saying that the original conception of the Komsomol—as shown by the documents of the First Congress—was at variance with the "strict centralized bureaucratic structure" that has existed in the "last 10, 20, or 30 years." "Regrettably, the way we today imagine the Komsomol—and there are of course reasons for this, because that is how it has been and to a large extent remains—is completely at odds with the original idea." Mironenko took issue with Shubin's remark that the aim of the Komsomol was merely to "propagate socialist ideas," and quoted a document from the First Komsomol Congress to show that the league's aims were broader.

Following attempts to stop him from speaking by members of the audience and a subsequent vote giving him the go-ahead, Boris Kogalnititskiy, described as "representative of the organizing committee of the Moscow People's Front," said: "We believe—and when I say 'we' I mean people currently in the organizing committee of the Moscow People's Front and the organizing committees of the People's Fronts throughout the country, or rather many parts of the country, including Kuybyshev, Yaroslavl, Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, and so on—our basic premise is that it is necessary to create qualitatively new structures that would make it possible to bring together Komsomol members and non-members, party members and non-party members, young people and those in the population who are not young, on the basis of democratic self-organization in the process of struggling for restructuring. Moreover, there must really be strict criteria of association here—not an association of each and all, on an unprincipled basis, but an association on the basis of the principles of democratic socialism and social justice, the principles that were proclaimed by our 1917 Revolution."

In reply to a claim of "equivocation" on secret and direct Komsomol elections, Mironenko stood up to say: "I can declare absolutely officially on behalf of the Central Committee that the Komsomol Central Committee is in favor of the Komsomol aktiv and cadres being elected by Komsomol members themselves without any restrictions."

A member of the audience proposed that the forthcoming plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee should call for the "declassifying of the archives of the Committee for State Security and Ministry of Internal Affairs relating at least to the young people repressed in the Stalinist years."

Mironenko was challenged on how he would feel if he were to stand for direct election by 38 million Komsomol members, rather than through the current two-stage

system under which members "elected electors." Mironenko said that if he were elected by 38 million people, "I could wash my hands of the Komsomol Central Committee and do what I wanted." The Central Committee served a purpose in preventing him and the other secretaries from "committing manifestly foolish actions." Returning to the federalist arguments, he said: "We are caught between Scylla and Charybdis. On the one hand, the advantages of the centralism we used to have threaten us with bureaucratic paralysis, but on the other hand we shall be threatened with demagogic paralysis and won't be able to adopt a single decision." The "golden mean" had to be sought, Mironenko said.

In a foyer interview, the head of a Yerevan political club said democracy and glasnost were society's "immune system": "If we hush things up and don't allow demonstrations and meetings to take place, things will escalate behind the scenes." He was standing next to the head of the Stepanakert political club, who introduced himself but was not interviewed in detail.

Doctor of Historical Sciences I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada urged in an interview that a law or regulation should be issued allowing people to hold demonstrations and "speak out," as long as they do not "block the street or prevent drivers or pedestrians from getting through."

Mironenko said in an interview that there was a need to "unite all who intend to help the party and who support the policy of restructuring, economic reform, glasnost, and democratization that is being pursued now." This should be done "irrespective of all the multifarious and differing opinions and individual points of view."

The meeting voted to pass a document which included the following statement: "We see the political clubs as a real force capable of helping the Komsomol to find a way out of its crisis and intensifying the democratization of the life of the league that began after the 20th Komsomol Congress."

In his closing remarks to the meeting, Mironenko said: "I believe that at the forthcoming plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee—and I feel that all members of the Central Committee will support this—our slogan should not be, 'He who is not with us is against us,' but on the contrary, 'He who is not against us is with us.'"

**MVD Statistics Document Anti-Alcohol Campaign's Failure**  
183000149 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 28 Nov 88 p 1

[Article by Valeriy Kondakov: "Sobriety And Only Sobriety"; first two paragraphs are readers' letters to the editorial office]

[Text] During the 3 years of fighting hard drinking we felt many humiliating experiments performed on us, namely, vodka coupons, extremely long lines at the



liquor stores, "sobriety zones" declared by persons unknown, and many other things. All this did not do anything good but rather was harmful, which is demonstrated by the explosion of moonshining, profiteering on alcohol sales, drug addiction, irregularities in sales of sugar, etc. B. Chernyshev, TET's maintenance man, Blagoveshchensk.

Recently, bottles with champagne, wine, and even brandy have reappeared in grocery stores. Does it mean that we only were talking about sobriety for some time and that is enough? Is the fighting with hard drinking going to fizzle out again? It hurts! A. Mikheyeva, Doctor, Moscow.

At the first glance, the readers' viewpoints are opposite. However, if one thinks more about it, both two letters are about the same subject, that is, about peoples' personal interests to confirm sobriety and the aspiration to preserve and strengthen its positions. Another matter is how and by what methods are we to achieve it? This time, the opinions of our numerous authors are very contradictory and, why to hide it, quite often are extreme, namely, either after experiencing obvious difficulties to sound the retreat by returning to the times of departmental feasts and "bars" in gateways, or to try holding the occupied positions by strengthening the palisade of shaken prohibitions with one more militia cordon at the liquor counter. We repeat, those are the extremes between which a sober look at sobriety is making its way, namely, that time has come to bring closer the propagandistic and educational rear services in order to start the offensive with ten-times-stronger forces.

While arguing ourselves hoarse, we sometimes do not even notice that during the recent years we have substantially changed ourselves and definitely have become smarter in the understanding the complicated problem. For example, we have recognized that we deal not with a "vestige of the past" but rather with a social phenomenon, which cannot be originated by anything else except the social causes and conditions. And, indeed, it is no coincidence that the highest wave of hard drinking came in the 60's, and after another decade the drug treatment centers and LTPs could not already admit all alcoholics. Obviously, this is directly connected with the stagnant phenomena in the society and the social fatigue they have generated, people's indifference, and the desire to leave the unattractive reality for the world of drunken dreams. Therefore, the readers angrily speak about the "epoch of the developed alcoholism" and the "period of feast". They speak with bitterness and pain.

Today we also understand another thing, namely, that the sharp turn toward sobriety was difficult not only for each of us but for the State as well. Before this turn we had a flagrant contradiction between the anathemas against wine sounding from podia and very real plans for

annual increases in alcohol production and sales. Since V. I. Lenin, who proclaimed a revolutionary dictatorship of sobriety, not a single of the following leaderships of the country dared to cut off, to stop the river of alcohol and, by this action, to reduce the amount of "drunken" rubles in the State revenue. "The statesmen of the stagnation period were consciously making people drunkards in order for them not to think about politics and not to notice the mountain of accumulated problems", a Novosibirsk engineer V. Knyazev reasonably thinks.

Only since the beginning of perestroika and the bold renovation of society, the intoxicating river have began to shallow instead of increasingly to overflow the banks. And to shallow substantially. The State has lost tens of billions of rubles in revenues due to this work of "drying up" the wine counter, but it consciously, with the understanding of responsibility for the people's future, made these sacrifices.

It made them, because of that there are less irreplaceable human victims. Only think about it: today there are by 200,000 people less than previously, who annually "drown" in wine. Men's mortality from accidents decreased by one-third. The average life expectancy has increased by 2 years. Crime caused by drunkenness has decreased... These are facts that could be measured by statistical data. And the peace and mutual understanding that emerged in many families and the sharply lowered point on the alcoholic scale, these are no lesser benefits.

In short, sobering took place, though it is still too far from sobriety. However, it appeared to certain hotheads, intoxicated by administrative enthusiasm, that the desired goal is almost achieved, that is, one must only push properly and tighten up nuts, and we may habitually report about the "ahead of schedule fulfillment of the directive concerning the total sobriety". And they pressed with all the force of administrative machinery and tightened nuts so well that the threads were torn off. Indeed, the grim imagination of an enraged bureaucrat, who is supposedly concerned for the health and morals of the people, has no limits. By his wish, crowds of people rushed to storm stores. Teenagers replaced a wine bottle with a syringe, or a polyethylene bag from khlorofos. Bulldozers, like tanks, moved on the well-known Massandra vineyards...

It seems that we did a lot of wrong things.

On the New Year's eve, the wife of the Onezhskiy tractor plant worker was trampled to death by a crowd near a liquor store. Now, a lonely man in an empty apartment is repeating with a reproach: "Cannot we fight for sobriety without a bloodshed?" Among the letters with responses to this tragedy, which was described by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, there is one from a war veteran from Siberia, I. Shokhin, who writes: "Why is it that on the eve of the V-Day, wearing my medals earned in action, I am forced to go in a hand-to-hand combat,

only this time charging not a nameless hill but a store's counter? Honestly, I could never imagine that in my old age I would need my combat experience and courage to withstand an angry mob in order to celebrate the sacred holiday".

Many readers are concerned about the moonshining epidemics, which was easily predictable prior to the introduction of excessively strict and often unjustified limitations on alcoholic beverages. As a result, thousands of women with coupons in their hand are standing long hours in lines for sugar for their children, while enterprising operators, after paying off the store assistants, are loading the deficit product from the back door in order to distill it into raw vodka.

However, let us leave emotions aside and go the dry report prepared for us by the MVD: "During the first half of this year over 170,000 cases of moonshining were revealed in the RSFSR, which is 2.8-fold more than during the same period of 1987. Two times more home-brewed beer and moonshine, namely, 1.8 million liters were destroyed. Compared with 1987, a 4-fold larger number of distilling apparatus were also destroyed. For buying moonshine, 43,500 people were fined. Profiteering through sales of alcoholic beverages has increased by one-third, and 5,000 thefts of alcoholic beverages at a total sum of 2.5 million rubles were revealed...."

Based on these facts, militia draws an unambiguous conclusion: "These crimes are the result of inaccessibility of alcoholic beverages due to the reduction in their production and sales, which was not supported by the necessary educational and economic measures"

"The theorists of the fight for sobriety are involved in a long and, it seems, futile polemics about the correlation between prohibition and education. Some insist that the prohibition should be first and the education comes next. Other argue that education should come first, and the prohibition will follow. Possibly, the way out is, as follows: not a prohibition after an education, and not an education after a prohibition, but rather an education and a prohibition in the indissoluble dialectic connection. This is the essence of today's anti-alcohol policy."

Of course, we may count on eliminating the results only by affecting their causes. The wine sales by themselves are not the main cause of hard drinking, like water is not guilty of flooding and fire is not guilty of house fires. And a real abstainer is not the one who is frightened by a wild crowd at the liquor store. It was Lev Tolstoy who wrote: "A man will get rid of hard drinking not when he will be deprived of the possibility to drink, but when he will not drink if wine would be in his room and he would feel its smell and would need only to reach out..."

So is wine guilty? Majority of the readers think that it is the fault of the man, who seeks oblivion in it, and add that we should blame the conditions pushing a man to drinking, namely, social, labor, domestic, material, and

cultural conditions. Finally, we cannot discount educational flaws, blurred life values, and individual personalities. And, I repeat, we must eradicate the causes and not only their bad results. This issue is not new, but, I think that only now, when the society is being radically restructured, we are beginning to search for a convincing answer to it, that is, we care for a material and spiritual values in a man's life.

Of course, the restructuring of a human soul and his everyday life will not be as fast as we would like it to be. In Lenin's words, "the strength of a habit of millions and tens of millions people is a terrible force". But this fact should not scare us, discourage, or accelerate events.

The Party document analyzing the present situation "On carrying out the CPSU Central Committee's resolutions on the subject of increasing the fight with hard drinking and alcoholism", which was published the other day, targets us on a realistic, active, and uncompromising approach to the problem of establishing sobriety. It is based on the ideas of perestroika and the moral revival of the nation. By correcting the extremes, which took place locally, it affirms a humane and respectful attitude toward a human personality. But it does not mean decreasing demands. The CPSU Central Committee charged the Party organizations with the task to react on principle and without compromises on any facts of anti-alcohol laws violation, the Communists' passiveness, especially, that of the leading Communists, and to implement the course on the healthy life style.

And this is a convincing answer to the reader A. Mikhayeva, with whose letter we started our conversation. And we want to conclude it with another letter. A worker of the Smolensk association Tekhnopribor, A. Privolnev thinks: "Hard drinking is one of the levers of the society's braking mechanism. We cannot go with it into the future. During the recent years we were talking much about the human factor. The human factor, and not the administrative measures, must become the main force in the fight for sobriety. Especially, when we are talking directly about people."

This is correct. Sobriety is for people and not vice versa. This and the future generations, the whole nation needs sobriety and only sobriety.

#### **Failure of Anti-Alcohol Campaign in Kirghizia Acknowledged**

*18300167 Frunze KOMMUNIST KIRGIZSTANA  
in Russian No 10 Oct 88 pp 88-91*

[Article by R.Gentsle, First Deputy Chairman of the Kirghizian Republican Council of the All-Union Volunteer Society for the Struggle for Sobriety: "To Make Our Work More Effective"; under the "Science, Education and Culture" rubric]

[Text] More than 3 years have passed since the CPSU Central Committee adopted the resolution "On Measures to Overcome Drunkenness and Alcoholism" in

May 1985, setting in active motion all social forces and tapping reserves to combat this social ill. Party, soviet and social organizations, labor collectives, the media and administrative entities have done great practical work to assert the sober way of life.

What are the early results of the anti-alcohol campaign? First of all, the country's demographic data has improved: the birth rate has increased somewhat, to 20 per thousand; average life expectancy has risen for the first time and alcohol-related deaths have declined 52 percent. Alcoholism has decreased: more than 35,000 chronic alcoholics were registered in the republic in 1986, compared to 33,000 on January 1, 1988. Absenteeism has declined, business parties have been abolished and drinking at work has stopped.

But, despite improvements in the struggle against drunkenness, many problems persist. In our opinion, only the kind of drunkenness that can be eliminated by a simple ban and stricter punishment has been eliminated. Yet, the main, deeply rooted drunkenness, represented by cultural or moderate drinking, which, in order to be eradicated, requires a change in social consciousness, has remained virtually unaffected.

The evil of drunkenness has not disappeared; it has retreated and is waiting for our struggle against alcoholism to slacken and to reveal itself as a temporary campaign; then, that evil would quickly regain surrendered positions. Nevertheless, in some areas of the republic deviations from the original decision have taken place; this was chiefly due to the disruptions of the financial mechanism that occurred at the start of the campaign. If along with limiting the sale of alcoholic beverages, timely measures had been taken to increase the production and broaden the assortment of available consumer goods, we would not have been returning repeatedly to the issue of opening additional stores to sell alcoholic beverages to enhance state revenues. Was it not the reason why the sale of alcoholic beverages rose in the first quarter of 1988 compared to the same period of the previous year? Compromises and retreats plant doubt in people and make them question the correctness and the necessity of the struggle.

This is why I think that the truth, however bitter, on the real dimensions of drunkenness and its fatal consequences should be told in full.

Violations of retail sale regulations still occur. For instance, one Serikbaev, a filing clerk at the Leninopolskiy Rayon, Talas Oblast, consumer goods distribution complex, got R10,500 worth of vodka at the warehouse of the city of Dzhambul, sold it at inflated prices and pocketed the difference. In all, 9,000 bottles of vodka were seized from black market operators.

All this shows the low level of responsibility of retail sales personnel in this area.

Here is another problem. For some reason, some people think that the very fact of formation of the Society for the Struggle for Sobriety solves all problems. A voluntary society can not overcome an entire layer of such ugly phenomena and drunkenness and alcohol-related crime, absenteeism, moonshine brewing, speculation, drug addiction, etc. These problems require daily attention from party, union and komsomol organization and the public.

Let us return to the facts. In 1987, over 25,000 persons were treated by sobering facilities, 2,593 cases of moonshine brewing and 743 cases of black market sale of alcoholic beverages were uncovered, 15,433 drivers were stopped for drunken driving and over 44,000 drunks were taken to police stations. The main cause of this is the slackening of the overall anti-drinking effort. The struggle against drunkenness and for the sober way of life has recently lost its intensity and is now viewed as a routine, the real situation is not being studied and the social consequences of the measures taken and decisions made are not taken into consideration.

In my opinion, we need an entity to coordinate this great educational and preventive work; it would set in motion all the links serving one goal only, to build a healthy way of life for members of the socialist society. We need to coordinate the work of cultural and sports organizations, retail enterprises and administrative and public entities. Currently, all of them participate in the sobriety movement and do a great deal of work, but each organization is on its own. Their effectiveness is low.

I would like to discuss in more detail the problem of home brewing. In the past year and a half it has assumed ugly, highly sophisticated forms. All social groups now engage in it, including workers, collective farmers, pensioners and engineering and technical personnel. For instance, in November 1987, engineer of the republican computer center Bukanov was found in possession of 20 liters of moonshine and employee of the KiSSR Academy of Sciences' Organic Chemistry Institute Grigoryev in possession of 25 liters. The greatest increase in home brewing has occurred in Issyk-Kul Oblast; 1,036 cases were reported there, accounting for 39 percent of the total. Some 117 cases were uncovered in Sokulukskiy Rayon and 132 in Keminskiy Rayon. Some engage in this activity to line their pockets, others to knowingly drive themselves to madness. Whatever the reason, it is a dangerous ill. Honest people and family members are the ones who suffer.

Facts increasingly show that our propaganda has unfortunately been unable to find effective countermeasures to overcome, scientifically and psychologically, existing pro-drinking prejudices and encourage positive attitude toward teetotalism. The propaganda that is called anti-alcoholic has never been directed against alcohol proper. The struggle is only against victims of alcohol, against those who did not wish to see the putative boundary between social drinking and alcohol abuse. Medical cure



is often presented as the only serious way of fighting drunkenness and alcoholism. Worse still, the media sometimes declares that if such forms of fighting for sobriety are ineffective, the sale of alcoholic beverages should not be banned at all. Yet, a majority of the population is increasingly insistent in its support for the active struggle against alcohol and decisively condemns customs involving alcohol consumption. The primary organizations of our society see their task in promoting dry events and carrying out preventive work. Here, we need efforts by all cultural and education entities, trade union and komsomol organizations and the media.

In the struggle against alcoholism, much depends on the activity of the voluntary sobriety society and on the systematic and skillful work of its primary organizations. The republic's primary organizations have just completed a round of reporting meetings and elections, as well as conferences of rayon, city and oblast councils. I must admit that at the center of participants' attention were ways to intensify the work of primary organizations and encourage creative initiative and independence among society members. It was noted that great efforts and energy have been devoted to improving anti-alcohol propaganda work, especially among young workers and students conducted at their place of residence and in the family, and to building public opinion opposed to the entrenched psychology of moderate, social drinking. Meetings and conferences were especially well organized in Aravanskiy, Lyaylyekskiy, Suzakskiy and Kalininskiy rayons and in Kara-Balta, Tokmak and other towns.

However, it should be admitted that too much formalism remains in the society's work. Many primary organizations do not know how to organize their work or what is most important in the teetotalers' movement and do not get proper guidance and support from local authorities. Worse still, some leaders, including party and soviet officials, are skeptical, and at times even sarcastic, about the efforts of improving the health of our society. It is no secret that many think that the sobriety society must fight alcoholics and drunkards, that they should be encouraged to join its ranks, etc. This naturally causes doubt among people, especially in the ranks of society members; they question whether or not their cause is right. And, if they see that enterprise or organization officials do not set a good example, there can be no question of fighting for the healthy, sober way of life.

The results of such attitude are plain for all to see. Reporting meetings and elections were poorly organized in a number of regions of the republic. I chiefly refer to Issyk-Atinskiy and Panfilovskiy rayons, Naryn Oblast. At the primary organization of the Issyk-Kul steam ship enterprise, ideas voiced at the meeting included the following: "there is no need for such a society," "everyone was forced to join the organization," "management does not belong to the society," etc.; yet, there is a great need to improve the situation at the steam ship enterprise, especially at its construction site where cases of drinking have been reported.

The primary party organization and management, as well as city party and soviet bodies, should be concerned about the state of affairs at the enterprise.

Everyone understands that it is hard for managing secretaries alone, without any support, to organize meetings or conferences and implement the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the government on combatting drunkenness and alcoholism and asserting the sober way of life. Nevertheless, the preparation of the conference in Dzhangy-Dzholskiy Rayon was left to the managing secretary alone. The result was low attendance and poor organization; not a single raykom secretary attended the meeting or met with activists of the teetotalers' movement, for whom the general goals of the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism were not spelled out. Nor were raykom secretaries present at conferences in Bazar-Kurganskiy and Issyk-Atinskiy rayons.

In the republic overall, the work of 299 of the society's organizations was found to be inadequate. The attendance at meetings in Sokululskiy Rayon was low, at 60 percent, as it was in Chuskiy, Issyk-Atinskiy and Dzhangy-Dzholskiy rayons, at 83 percent.

Problems also dog the selection of the society's cadres in the republic. Since its inception, 65 percent of managing secretaries of rayon and city councils have been replaced, and at such rayons as Manasskiy and Frunzenskiy, Osh Oblast, they have changed four times and Panfilovskiy, Chatkalskiy and Kara-Suyskiy rayons twice in each; the managing secretary position at the Dzhalal-Abad town council was vacant for 5 months, in Frunze for 7 months and in Frunze's Pervomayskiy rayon for 8 months.

The reasons for such turnover are underestimation of the importance of the voluntary society's role, weak guidance given to the society by local party and soviet entities and of course poor conditions. Local organizations show little interest how, in what conditions, the society's staff has to work.

During the reporting and election period, many suggestions and proposals to improve our work were expressed. Some people proposed banning the sale of alcoholic beverages during working hours, intensifying the fight against home brewing, etc. As to existing laws, we have not been using them to their full extent. Since the beginning of 1988, the sale of homemade fruit and berry liqueurs has been prohibited. Yet, it goes on in the republic, at prices that are affordable even for vocational school and college students. "...In the name of safeguarding the social health of the population we are forced to reduce the production and sale of alcoholic beverages," said Comrade M.S.Gorbachev at the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This is a party directive that should give us firm guidance.

The struggle against the black market in alcoholic beverages is still slack. In 1987, 743 cases of such activities were reported, but the law was not applied rigorously to

retail trade employees and to those who profited from such speculation. A principled and competent application of the law would have helped advance the struggle against this negative phenomenon. Society members take an extremely small part in combatting the black market in alcoholic beverages.

Extremely unfortunately, the period of struggle for the sober way of life has laid bare the shady side of some people's character, their extremely low level of civic consciousness, parasitic desires and willingness to profit by theft, crime, etc. To overcome all these negative phenomena, we need a joint, determined and persistent effort by party, soviet, trade union and komsomol organizations and management, with the broad participation of the public.

Today we are profoundly convinced that we need an uncompromising struggle against alcohol and its total replacement by other activities, mass-produced goods and services. Socialism can not be built with rubles earned from alcohol sales. V.I. Lenin said that socialism and alcoholism are incompatible. Moreover, we should fight deficiencies in the system of social relations, improve such relations, encourage a creative attitude toward work, solve cultural questions, strive to shape a harmoniously developed human being, a master of his health and emotions, one who can coordinate his own desires with the interests and means of the society.

Copyright: Izdatelstvo TsK Kompartii Kirgizii, "Kommunist Kirgizstana," 1988

## Estonian Draft Law on Language Discussed

### Academic Lotman Comments

18000140 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 30 Oct 88 p 3

[Article by Yu. Lotman, doctor of philosophical sciences, professor at the Tartu State University Russian Literature Department: "A Law on Language is Needed"]

### Why is a Law on Language Needed?

[Text] Language is a necessary element of any national culture, and of any cultural in general. Without language there is no culture. The degree of development of a language is a true indicator of the development of the culture as a whole. Therefore, a threat to the language is a threat to the culture; and a threat to the culture is a threat to the very existence of the nation.

But why then were special measures required in defense of the Estonian language? After all, no one has banned it; and, it seems, there is no threat to its existence, is there?

Of course no one has banned the Estonian language, but let us look into the matter a little deeper: A language can carry out its role as the organizer of culture only when it is free to serve all aspects of the life and activity of a given nation, and is actually used in all spheres of its life. If a situation evolves in which one language is used in one sphere of public practice (for example, in the administrative or scientific sphere), and the other is used in another sphere (for example, in everyday life), this in the final analysis inevitably leads to the displacement of one of them. Thus, for example, in the Middle Ages, in Europe, the popular language was used in domestic life, but in the sphere of theoretical knowledge, Latin was used. There were certain advantages to this: scholars in all parts of Europe understood one another extremely well. And nevertheless, Latin was displaced, since otherwise the national languages would not have been able to become the cultured languages of their nation. But when in such a situation there is a clash between the languages of a small nation and that of a multi-million-member nation—and when, moreover, the latter language performs the state-organizational functions in one of the very largest countries in the world, then without any ban whatsoever, the language of the smaller nation is threatened with dissolution.

Meanwhile one must lose sight of the fact that during the years of Stalin's rule, a deliberate policy of discrimination in the area of national languages and national culture led to the creation of a genuine threat to the development of the Estonian language in particular. Now Stalin's regime no longer exists; but, there is another threat to national languages: the bureaucracy. A bureaucrat, unless he is an old Stalinist, has no enmity toward national cultures. He simply proceeds from the premise that he was not created for the people; but that the people were created for him, for his convenience; and if it's easier for him to read in his own language, well then let everyone read in his language. We shall cite an example. Our readers no doubt are aware

of the existence of an organization called VAK [Higher Attestation Commission], which certifies all academic degrees. What would our readers say if they were informed that their dissertations on Pushkin and Sholokhov, or on Russian grammar, had to be written in Estonian? They would be upset, and rightly so. But you see dissertations on Estonian literature or the Estonian language must be submitted to VAK in Russian, in order that the government official does not have difficulty reading the titles, written in the language of a sovereign union republic. As he thought up this rule, the bureaucrat probably did not think about hurting the feelings and encroaching on the rights of the people—he was thinking about his own convenience. Unfortunately, even now one often hears from certain leaders objections to the law on language, dictated out of concern for their own convenience; although at the same time one hears high-flown words about state interests, which are allegedly encroached upon by everyone, save this or that bureaucrat.

And so, a law on protecting language is needed just as much as a law on protecting nature. In both instances we are talking about the same thing: about a nation defending itself and its culture from the bureaucracy.

### Who Needs the Law on Language?

The natural answer is: Estonia and her national culture. But is she the only one? There are great and small nations, but there are no great and small cultures. The role of one culture or another in the world cultural community is not determined by the number of people who speak one language or another or by the space on a map: both the great and the small nations are equally capable of making a great contribution to world culture. The population of ancient Athens would not exceed the number of citizens of a small modern city, and Florence of the 13th and 14th centuries was smaller than modern Tartu. But this did not prevent these city-states from playing a very great role in the history of world culture. It is not only the people of various nations who are interested in the development of their culture, but their neighbors as well, and mankind as a whole. The development of Estonian culture not only does not encroach upon the interests of other nations—on the contrary, it is altogether in harmony with these interests. This pertains in particular to the non-Estonian population of Estonia: it too stands to benefit from further development of Estonian culture. After all, everyone wants to live in a cultured country, and no one stands to gain from the inevitable partners of the suppression of a national culture: mutual enmity, suspicion and hurt feelings.

### Does the Draft Law Defend the Rights of the Non-Estonian Populace of the Republic?

The draft Law on Language was established by democratic means: it was worked out by a broad public commission, comprised of competent and impartial specialists, and it is being submitted for popular discussion, in which all linguistic groups of our republic will take part. The draft law defends the interests of all residents



of Estonia regardless of the national and linguistic group to which they belong. Above all, it gives all citizens of Estonia the right to use the language of their own preference in all spheres of their private lives. Moreover, in appealing to any state and administrative authorities, a citizen of Estonia may use his own language, and he is guaranteed the right to receive the answer and any other information he needs, in that same language.

In this respect one cannot help notice that, if one speaks not of formally existing rights which are often not realized, but of real rights—in the given situation, legal guarantees are given in equal measure both to an Estonian who does not speak Russian, and to a Russian who has not mastered the Estonian language: they will no longer have to depend on the mood or the arbitrariness of a functionary in a government office, on a salesgirl in a store, or on any other person who represents the state: they are obliged to answer in the very same language as that in which the question is asked. The nature of the intercourse within collectives is determined by the language make-up of these collectives, and shall be resolved by democratic means. The democratic nature of the measures envisaged are specifically expressed in the fact that in case of language difficulties in communication between a supervisor and his subordinate, the language of exchange is recognized as the language of the subordinate. This also protects not just any national group, but a social group—the people. The law completely guarantees the rights of the non-Estonian populace in court, in the sphere of medical and social services; and in the realm of education, trade, and social security. One should pay attention to the fact that the draft law is careful to guarantee the creation of a situation in which the strengthening of state and cultural functions of the Estonian language would not take place at the expense of other languages, and that the rights and interests of the populace which uses other languages would not be affected.

#### Does the Draft Law Offend Anyone Else's Interests?

Yes it does. One must speak bluntly about this. It offends the interests of the bureaucrats, and especially at the upper echelons. The draft law deals a severe blow to a situation in which the director of a major enterprise considers himself in an extraterritorial situation and could calmly destroy the living environment without consulting neither the local Soviets, much less the public pure and simple—with whom he does not communicate and sees no need to do so, maintaining contacts only with his central administration. Real democratization requires considering the opinion of the populace, and responding to its needs, and understanding its feelings, and not only "chasing gross output." For many government offices this will seem strange and will require a fundamental restructuring of their style of operating. A simple person, no matter which language he speaks, stands only to gain from the Law on Language.

#### What is the Ultimate Goal of the Draft Law on Language?

During the period of Stalin's rule, an illusory although loudly-proclaimed "unity" concealed deeply smoldering

and increasingly profound conflicts in society. As a result genuine enmity sprang up between the Estonian and Russian populace in the republic, the fruits of which we must now reap. The goal of the draft law, as well as many other measures conducted by the Popular Front, is to make the atmosphere healthier, and establish the true unity of the peoples of Estonia. Specifically, the law focuses attention on the necessity for organizing an extensive, voluntary system of training the Russian-language populace in the Estonian language (Until now the accent was placed only on the need to train the Estonians in the Russian language). This important matter should in the final analysis lead to free intercourse among the citizens of Estonia, without language barriers and difficulties. Until now very little has been done in this direction; and right now when a large number of instructors are needed right away, as well as textbooks and methodological literature, Estonian linguists are faced with a great deal of work. We hope that the esteemed collective of the Estonian Language Department at Tartu State University will head up this work. The scientific and methodological forces are there, and the importance of the task is clear as well. It is not enough to set deadlines for training—it must be genuinely supported.

#### Will Not the Introduction of the Law on Language Bring About the Cultural Isolation of Estonia?

No, it will not. Moreover, one must suppose that the development of Estonian culture will bring about growing interest in it beyond the borders of Estonia. It is well known that the rapid development of Estonian poetry and prose in recent years has brought about sharply increased interest in it in other republics. A new specialty is being developed at Tartu State University: Estonian-Russian translators. The Russian-language culture of Estonia is receiving new stimulus as well. It is no secret that until now, the attendance at the Russian dramatic theater in Tallinn had been significantly lower than the attendance at Estonian theaters, and that subscribers to the interesting magazine RADUGA is greater outside Estonia than in the republic. The need for more fully satisfying the cultural needs of the Russian-language public should invigorate the literary and theatrical ties with Leningrad, Moscow and other centers.

A great many problems remain to be solved, and a great deal of creative work lies ahead. And it is precisely creative work. And so, we must take it up in a friendly and calm manner, being guided by reason, and not inciting passions.

#### Press Conference Held

18000140 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in  
Russian 30 Oct 88 p 4

[ETA report by P. Raydia: "On the State Language and a Lot More"]

[Text] A press conference was held on the evening of 28 October in the White Hall of the House of Radio with I.

Toome, Estonian CP Central Committee secretary; E. Pyldroos, candidate member of the Estonian CP Central Committee Bureau, chairman of the board of the ESSR Artists' Society, and leader of a working group on questions of the status of the Estonian language; K. Kiysk, member of the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet; M. Khint, a specialist in linguistics; I. Fyuk, chairman of the Cultural Council, ESSR Creative Societies; T. Kyabin, a political scientist; L. Meri, a writer, and journalists. The conference was held to discuss the draft Law on Language, the current situation in Estonia, and a lot more.

Opening the press conference, Pyldroos reported with alarm that in recent months the situation in Estonia has become increasingly critical. For example, protests are being made against "intentions" to close Russian schools, although no one has any intention of doing so. There were also "comradely warnings" about declaring strikes.

But the greatest danger lies in the confrontation of the two national groups. We must get a serious grasp on this entire situation. When it becomes "wall to wall," each of the sides is strong enough to impede one another. A situation of stalemate could arise. Many representatives of the Russian-language population have joined the Popular Front, but even the Inter-Movement has received more members. But the majority consists of those who do not have a hardened position. The search for allies is at the same time extending one's hand. We must be on our guard with respect to demonstrations which have as their goal winning cheap popularity and worming their way into the press. The call of the council of the Forum of Nations should be supported in every way; namely, to have nothing to do with people who speak out in insulting tones against another nation. Arrogance could be turned into an offense against one's own nation.

The draft Law on Language is the first draft law in Estonia in the period of perestroika, and the further democratization of our life and the fate of IME depend upon it.

M. Khint reported on the fact that there was inadequate reaction among Estonians as well. For example, at a conference held recently in Rakverskiy Theater, appeals were heard that would turn the calendar back 100 years; namely, to revive the use of the Viru, Vyr, and Ostrov dialects. It was asserted that the true Estonian national culture had allegedly disappeared from the Estonian literary language. From this the strange conclusion was derived, that the Russification of the Estonian literary language was not a great loss. This point of view was greeted with thunderous applause, which testifies to the fact that many people did not want to delve deeply into what they had heard. The conference also accepted a letter of protest to the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, opposing its decision to submit the draft Law on Language to nationwide discussion.

We must be able to maintain an atmosphere of calm; for otherwise nothing will come of the discussion. The voice of reason could turn into a voice crying in the wilderness.

I. Fyuk expressed his concern with respect to the fact that the events taking place in Estonia are not well understood abroad either. They lack a clear-cut conception of the 20's, the 30's, the 40's, the 50's, the 60's and the 70's in Estonia; therefore it is difficult for them to grasp the situation of today as well. The Law on Language was conceived in order to protect the Estonian language. This is a law which gives equal rights to the Estonian and Russian languages.

Fyuk also spoke of the fact that for now the most important task is to construct a lawful state. It is necessary to proceed from reality and not from the illusions which hold certain people captive. In the present situation any incendiary speech might incite to action only the foes of perestroika.

K. Kiysk gave favorable marks to the program aired the other evening on Estonian television, in which the draft Law on Language was examined. Such programs should be shown continuously in order to scrupulously examine each article of the draft. This will help not only in understanding it, but also in discovering its shortcomings.

L. Meri dwelt on the current situation in language training, which at one time was significantly influenced by Stalin's maniacal fear of the outer world; hence all language study suffered. Today, even in the VUZes, the level of language study is lower than in the tsarist gymnasias, to say nothing of secondary schools. Those who receive a secondary education in Estonia have in general not had an opportunity to properly learn the Estonian language.

"Perestroika was begun in order that the peoples and the nations would awaken from their lethargic dreams of the stagnation period," said I. Toome. "And also, in order that the nations would begin to think about who they are, about their position, and about their aspirations. Many have already begun to comprehend this. But the most important thing to grasp lies in the fact that a great many things must be decisively rejected, in order to begin to make progress on the path of perestroika, on the path to democratization, on the path to recognition of humanistic principles. It has not been possible to achieve a great deal in three years, but that perception itself is a great achievement. Now the concrete embodiment of certain principles begins. In the area of international relations, what we have achieved is that a great deal of work has been accomplished in working out the Law on Language." Toome stressed that this event is of extraordinary and principal importance. Will the "status quo" in the direction pointed out for us by the party be changed, and will the people determine the principles of their lives or not? Will everything continue to go on in

the old way, or will we begin to make something that is principally new. The draft Law on Language serves as the first principled step on the long journey which is to come.

Today there is nothing more important than the consolidation of the entire nation. So much is at stake, that one must not place group interests higher than the interests of the nation. Those who do not understand and who continue to behave in a provocative manner are acting against the national interest. Both the Estonian and the Russian-speaking public must understand this.

The subject then turned to the adoption of a Law on Language by our southern neighbors. It was pointed out that in Latvia there are plans to introduce such a draft law for national discussion on 1 January, and to adopt it as law already in February. Lithuania does not yet have a constitutional amendment on the status of the state language, nor is there a draft Law on Language; however, they are showing great interest in our draft, which is to be published there in the near future. Thus, in this regard, Estonia is the first union republic to achieve as much.

Those taking part in the meeting were asked to comment upon the article, "One Land and One Fate," which appeared in PRAVDA on 21 October. Toome stated that the Estonian CP Central Committee has its own point of view, and he is acting in accordance with that viewpoint. Thus, the work on the draft Law on Language having been completed, the necessity is also recognized for it to achieve general recognition; for the position of the Estonian CP Central Committee is at odds with the position of PRAVDA's Department of Social Policy and Communist Education.

Khint added that Stalin's language and nationality policy has not yet been re-interpreted, and therefore everything continues to go on in the old spirit.

Emphasis was given to the need to speak more extensively in the press about the concept of a national republic per se. This, then, turned the conversation to the recently-published draft USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Constitution of the USSR. E. Pyldroos gave an altogether negative assessment to the draft on amendments and supplements, in that it totally conflicts with the aspirations of Estonia. It is obvious that if these changes are put into effect, there can no longer be any discussion of a republic's sovereignty. In his opinion, it is very important to put these thoughts directly to Moscow.

Toome also gave a negative assessment to the draft law. It seemed to him too that the situation would not improve, as was stressed at the 19th Party Conference; on the contrary, it would worsen. In many respects centralization would be stepped up. This must not be allowed. The people were promised democratization of their lives and not centralization at a new level. Toome also added that the Estonian CP Central Committee and

the ESSR Supreme Soviet have recommended to all their subordinate elements to thoroughly analyze this draft from all angles. Proposals are to be presented to the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, from whence they will be sent to Moscow. Toome expressed his opinion, that it probably would be expedient for the Estonian CP Central Committee to express its own point of view to the CPSU Central Committee on the basis of these proposals, taken together.

Fyuk noted that the USSR Constitution must guarantee a republic the right to veto when a resolution is adopted. Presently the special opinion of one republic, or even a number of the small republics, is not on the whole really given consideration.

Those taking part in the press conference dwelt on certain other problems as well.

But the most important thing at present is the forthcoming national discussion of the draft Law on Language. One would like to think that all citizens of Estonia, whether they speak Estonian, Russian or other languages, would approach the discussion with all seriousness. A constructive attitude, mutual understanding and mutual respect are needed. Only in such a manner can we arrive at a solution satisfactory to all nations.

#### Public Discussion Procedures Explained

18000140 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in  
Russian 30 Oct 88 p 4

[ETA report by K. Propst: "On the Procedure for Conducting Public Discussion of Important Questions of the State and Public Life of the Estonian SSR"]

[Text] The draft Law on Language of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, which is submitted by decision of the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for public discussion, is being published today in the newspapers RAKhVA KhYaEL and SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA.

The procedure for conducting nationwide discussion in our republic is defined in the Law of the Estonian SSR on Popular Discussion of Important Questions of State and Public Life, which was adopted in April 1988 by the ESSR Supreme Soviet.

The submission to public discussion of draft laws and other important questions of state and public life in the republic is accomplished upon decision of the ESSR Supreme Soviet or the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and are adopted upon their own initiative. Recommendations on the expedience of submitting questions for public discussion may be given by standing commissions of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, the ESSR Council of Ministers, Soviets of People's Deputies of rayons or cities of republic subordination; by republic organs of social organizations; by labor collectives; and by other



organs and persons, who in accordance with the law have the right to present a draft law or another question to the ESSR Supreme Soviet or to its Presidium.

The law guarantees to all citizens of our republic free participation in public discussion, and any limitations are forbidden.

In the discussion of questions submitted for public discussion, citizens have the right to take part directly, or through social organizations, labor collectives, meetings at their place of residence, meetings of servicemen at their military units, as well as through the mass information media.

Taking part in the preparation and the conduct of the discussion of important questions are party, trade union, Komsomol, cooperative, and women's organizations; veterans of war and labor organizations; as well as other social organizations and labor collectives.

Citizens may direct their proposals and remarks on draft laws and other questions submitted for public discussion to the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, executive committees of local Soviets of People's Deputies, and to other state or social organs, or to their own deputies.

Drafts of laws and other questions submitted for public discussion may be discussed at sessions of Soviets of People's Deputies, and at meetings of their organs and deputy groups; at gatherings of social organizations and labor collectives, and at one's residence; at organs of public volunteer activities; by servicemen at their military units; in the press, and on radio and television.

Proposals and remarks submitted in the course of the discussion are summarized by the appropriate executive committees of local Soviets of People's Deputies, or by other state and public organs, or mass information media. In order to summarize proposals and remarks, the indicated organs may form commissions or working groups.

Proposals and remarks on the draft Law on Language are to be directed in summary form to the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet once a week until 25 November 1988.

All the proposals on the draft ESSR Law on Language received at the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium are examined and taken under consideration by a working group on the status of the Estonian language established at the Supreme Soviet Presidium. The results of the popular discussion are examined by the Commission on Legislative Suggestions of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and by the ESSR Supreme Soviet itself upon adoption of the law.

Local soviet and other state organs, administrators of enterprises, institutions and organizations, and social organizations must establish the necessary conditions in order for the draft ESSR Law on Language be given broad examination.

Citizens, labor collectives, and state and social organizations whose proposals will not be considered in revising the draft ESSR Law on Language shall be informed on the reasons for the rejection of their proposals.

The mass information media shall provide information on all aspects of the course of the discussions, and shall publish proposals and remarks, as well as reviews of the proposals and remarks received.

It goes without saying that the more the citizens express their opinions and submit proposals and remarks, the more comprehensive the draft Law on Language will be. Let everyone, then, actively take part all together in the final development of the draft Law on Language of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

#### **Medvedev Speaks at 'Yekabpils' Agrofirm**

18000230a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
17 Nov 88 pp 1,3

[LATINFORM report entitled: "We Must Live Together Here: Meeting of V.A. Medvedev With Farm Administrators and Workers at the agrofirm imeni XXV Syezd KPSS and the Yekabpils Agroindustrial Association"]

[Excerpts] On 13 November V. A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of CPSU Central Committee, visited the Agrofirm imeni XXV Syezd KPSS in Yekabpilsskiy Rayon. His acquaintance with the farm collective began in the club, where there was a meeting between the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the farm administrators and the workers of the agrifirm and the Yekabpils agroindustrial association. The meeting was opened by A. K. Vrublevskiy, First Secretary of the party's Yekabpilsskiy Raykom.

[passage omitted]

Then V. A. Medvedev spoke to those who had gathered there. He said:

I consider that I will learn a lot from this meeting with you, the workers at the agroindustrial association, the agrifirm, and the farms that are part of the association, and with the rayon leadership. This is a good opportunity to exchange opinions with regard to the most acute, most important food and agrarian questions. Of all the urgent tasks in our country's development, and consequently in the course of perestroika, probably the most important place is occupied by the food problem. In general it is the main problem in a person's everyday life. But in addition the situation has developed in such a way that, despite the slight improvement in the production of food products in the country, there have not been any noticeable improvements in providing the population with products during the years when perestroika has

been in effect. Certain questions have even become more acute. Currently, when we are changing over from analysis and discussions to the practical implementation of perestroika, it is natural that larger positive shifts in this area are needed. This is an overall requirement of the nation. One can, of course, give explanations: why this situation developed, and wherein the essence of the food problem lies. I think that today we shall not develop our discussion in this direction, although I do want to recall certain factual data and observations. For example, one can compare what we have today and what we had 20-25 years ago. There was a situation that Yan Yanovich Vagris and I recalled while we were en route here: there had been a moment in the republic when no one knew what to do with meat. There were large reserves of it, although the consumption in the country during that period did not exceed 40 kilograms per person. I would also like to recall that we ought to compare the development of our food base with the population's income. Any wages must be truly earned on all plots. They should not precede the output, but, rather, they should follow it, or proceed alongside of it. Labor productivity should grow more rapidly than the population's income. The easiest thing is to say that we need more of this, that, or the other. But it is necessary to compare one thing with another. It is necessary to analyze both the consumption figures and, of course, the income. Obviously, this principle is necessary and is a just one not only as applicable to you, but also is a general principle of economic policy at the present-day stage throughout the republic, throughout the country, in all branches. It must operate also with respect to cooperatives. In their collectives the wages must also be earned and must be linked with a real increase in our wealth, our output.

What can be said about the republic's contributions to the resolution of the food problem? It has been a major contribution, a very large one. You know the figures. You also know about the existence of the nationwide division of labor. That division is necessary because some republics produce more coal, metal, machinery, or petroleum, other republics produce more machinery, and still other produce more foodstuffs. Specialization depends upon historical traditions and upon local conditions, and this is completely natural. And so, in the nationwide division of labor, our republic occupies an important place in industry, primarily in the processing industry. I would say the "finishing industry." That is, our republic produces finished items that go either immediately to the consumer or to other branches of the national economy. And, I repeat, Latvia occupies an important place in fulfilling the country's food program. The republic has been viewed and continues to be viewed as a region of highly competent management, primarily of commercial animal husbandry, and meat and dairy management.

It is with a consideration of this and other objective circumstances that all the questions are being resolved. These include the problems that pertain to the supplying of grain output. The grain that goes to meet the republic's

own food needs is entirely shipped here from elsewhere in the country. But the grain that is produced in the republic is not used to meet these needs. Except for rye. As for fodder grain, more than half the need is also shipped in. The effectiveness of the use of concentrated fodders here, under conditions of intensive, highly developed animal husbandry is higher than in the other regions of the country. True, there are republic which are on a par with you, and also, in a certain respect, ahead of you. But on the whole, I might note once again, you are having high effectiveness in the use of concentrated fodders.

This year a complicated situation was created with regard to grain. Essentially speaking, we have not been harvesting as much of it as compared with the plan or with last year, which, incidentally, also was not a lavish one in this regard. It is necessary to buy grain in large quantities abroad. But even doing this is no simple matter. Because we have a total amount of currency resources that is many million rubles less than in past years because of the low prices of fuel and energy resources. It is necessary to take all of this together into consideration. But I assure you that the government is working on this, with a consideration of the situation that is developing. It is attempting to find the least painful way out and is attempting to prevent a reduction in the number of head of livestock, especially the highly productive livestock. It is, of course, very, very difficult to restore it. And we have had sad experience in this regard. At one time, after we had allowed the number of head of livestock to decline, it was not until 5-7 years later that we managed to restore that number. It is natural therefore that a considerable part—in my opinion, one-third—of the commercial meat output goes from Latvia into the nationwide fund. This is a natural process if there is division of labor and regional specialization.

As for agriculture, it has been experiencing a shortage of meat almost everywhere. Of course, it would seem that a correct principle would be: if you produce a certain kind of output, you ought to have the first right to use it. But, comrades, other facts go into effect here. Price factors, factors linked with subsidy. These are not simple questions. All aspects of the use of domestic resources are important here. For example, the maintaining of livestock on a private plot. Here too, unfortunately, the processes in the vanguard are not positive, but negative. For the republic as a whole, half the peasant families do not have any cows, and one-third do not have any livestock at all. Are we really to believe that it is normal for a peasant not to want to maintain livestock, but prefers to buy meat? Moreover, at prices that are such that every kilogram includes two rubles of state subsidies?

Many questions that have been asked here pertain to intensifying the aid provided to agriculture, the creation of real conditions that are the most favorable for developing agrarian production and for guaranteeing the material-technical supplying of the rural areas. Questions of providing rural residents with building materials are very essential ones. The policy of central management is clear and precise here: it is necessary first of all—

and previously it used to be decided last of all, on the basis of the surplus principle—to make allocations of building materials for sale to the public. First of all, this is a resolution of a social problem, and secondly, it is also economically important: the commodity funds increase, the population's monetary resources are mobilized, and the market is normalized. But the most important thing is that this enables a person to feel that he is his own boss. It enables him to set up his own plot, build his own house, live a normal life in it, and leave a good inheritance to his heirs.

The questions about the quality and prices of agricultural equipment are also correct. I think that they will be considered in the most attentive manner both during the period of preparation for the Plenum on agriculture and at the Plenum itself. Major steps are being taken to modernize domestic agricultural machine-building and the entire agroindustry chain—from the growing of produce to the sale of that produce to the public. The party's Central Committee is keeping a close watch to see that there is no encroachment upon the needs of the agrarian sector for economic support and capital investments. But simultaneously one's attention is attracted by the fact that the existing and the allocated capital investments must be used in the most effective way. First of all they are being channeled into the most important areas and into the worst bottlenecks. These currently include: the intactness of agricultural output; its transportation and processing; and putting it into modern commercial form. Because we lose a very large amount of produce at these stages. There have been various computations. But they can all be summarized as stating that at these stages we lose no less than 20-25 percent of the final output. There would be no need for us to increase any more its production at the rates that are being proposed, if we could be more efficient in storage, transporting, and processing.

Another question is the improvement of production relations in the rural areas. This problem has been touched on here in a number of statements. Mention was made also about the restoration of the individual peasant farm, and of rent. But, so far as I can determine, what the speakers had in mind was only the traditional form of peasant farm. This can probably be explained by the traditional existence in Latvia of individual farms with respect to which, at one time, the attitude taken was not completely correct. One might even say that attitude was completely incorrect. Now it is difficult to restore them. Therefore I understand the comrades who have mentioned to need for firm legislative guaranteed.

The restructuring of economic relations in the rural areas affects the entire series of problems pertaining to the individual private farm and rent. And the contract within large-scale farms—and you have a large-scale farm—would make it possible to have people being truly the bosses in production. I think that the experience of creating the association and the agrifirm deserves the greatest amount of attention, study, and support. Keep moving along that path.

And now a few words about questions of administration. The agroprom system was created several years ago and it needs major improvement, simplification, and the overcoming of old traditions and habits in command situations. Methods of encouragement through output and through the final results are needed. Everything else must be resolved locally: on the kolkhozes and sovkhazes, on the animal farms, in the brigades, and in the rental and contract collectives, the person who must make the decisions is the peasant himself.

Our party's Central Committee views social questions in inseparable bond with the economic and scientific-technical ones. Steps have been taken to assure that the expenses for social needs are not formed in accordance with the remainder principle. Several billion rubles have been found and allocated to carry out measures to reform school education. In medicine, many questions pertaining to wages and the increasing of appropriations for the material-technical base have been resolved. But this is by no means enough to bring education and public health everywhere up to the modern level that would conform both to our people's practical needs and also to their cultural ones. I want to add to this that the local soviet, in and of itself, does not have any special appropriations, and without relying upon the farms on its territory there will be no movement ahead. If you will, this too is an element of territorial cost accountability. At the present time work is under way to assure the closer tying together of local self-government, the financial base of the local soviets, with the economy of their territory. A law governing local self-government and the local economy is being prepared. That law will deal with questions not only of economic relations along the vertical—from top to bottom, and from bottom to top—but also along the horizontal. It will be necessary to expand considerably the soviets' rights and capabilities, and to attract financial resources when resolving problems of the social infrastructure in every rayon. These same questions, naturally, also arise with respect to the republics. The problems of republic-level cost accountability are currently being developed intensively both in the republics and in the center. Within a few days Comrade Ryzhkov will be convoking a meeting of representatives of the councils of ministers of the republics in order to discuss questions of regional cost accountability and to work out the principles of approaching this matter.

And now I would like to discuss a question that had not caused any heated discussions here, but which also was mentioned in a number of statements. Taking onto consideration the social and political situation that is developing in the republic, I am very impressed by the idea that was expressed here, to the effect that, irrespective of the language the farm workers speak, you understand one another perfectly. I think that this is just what we need. We need to converse in our own languages, in different languages, but also to achieve mutual understanding in all questions of our joint life. This will truly be internationalism in action. And it is very pleasant that that idea has been supported by the comrades here. If it reflects the true situation in your rayon, this is very good.



In conclusion I want to say that I am very pleased with our meeting. All the views were expressed by the comrades in a self-interested, concerned form. They will be taken into consideration and reported to the leadership of the party's Central Committee. They will be analyzed. I want to wish you success in your undertaking of organizing the new system of administering the agroindustrial complex on a modern basis with a consideration of the new problems of perestroika and the regulation of economic relations. It seems to me that today's discussion indicates that you have this striving.

[End of Medvedev speech]

Then a brief statement was made by Ya. Ya. Vagris, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia, who has been accompanying V. A. Medvedev on his trip. He said that he had made a note of a number of specific questions raised at the meeting which would have to be resolved at the republic level.

After the statements, lively, relaxed conversation started up right there in the auditorium. It began with a question from G. S. Sviklis, head of the Agriculture Department of the party's Yekabpilsskiy Raykom.

[G. S. Sviklis] Vadim Andreyevich, what is your impression of the recent events in the republic? I have in mind the questions of changing over to regional cost accountability, the organizing of the People's Front, and other questions that have caused lively discussion.

[V. A. Medvedev] Of course the people's rate of activity and the lack of indifference produce a large and good impression. And this is the result of perestroika. But there are factors that cause concern. They include individual extreme, and I would say even extremist, statements. It is alarming that some of these manifestations have been find their way into the press. I do not know whether you saw the drawing in RODNIK magazine on the inside of the back cover.

[Voices] Yes, we've seen it.

[V. A. Medvedev] Well, then? What attitude is a person supposed to take to this?... And there have been other extreme manifestations—excessive emotions and certain suspicions that certain people would not completely understand the national questions and national needs. But that incomplete understanding has not occurred. We are all in favor of developing the Latvian nation, their language, and their culture. Especially since this is a brilliant and traditional culture that has won authority and fame through the Union and abroad. There are no problems here. But there are other problems. It is necessary for the republic's economic and social development to proceed not under its own momentum, not in a spontaneous, unplanned manner, but for that development to be constantly under attentive, analyzing scrutiny. That pertains both to the economy and to the makeup of the population. All of this must be analyzed,

but one must not act by using methods of administrative fiat or even of legislative decision. It is necessary to see the inner essence of things, to search for the reasons. And then to try to eliminate them. I have had a very good impression about the Communists. About the party organization and the leadership. What exists here, in my opinion, is a complete understanding of the tasks and the situation. We feel that the nation supports the republic's leadership. It is necessary to take the present moment into consideration and to emerge from it with dignity. We are convinced that this will be done without any pressure from above, by means of understanding and by using political methods.

Ya. Ya. Vanags, director of the Zasa Sovkhoz: We see the deserted villages in the Nonchernozem Region of RSFSR. What is being done in the country to revive them? Practically the same guberniyas, the same Pskov and Kalinin oblasts, prior to World War I provided Russia with grain, but now those villages are deserted.

[V. A. Medvedev] In general that is correct. But the needs for grain were, of course, different. In general, grain production has grown. But this is truly a serious page in our economic history. It has its reasons, which cannot be considered only within the confines of the Nonchernozem Region itself or even the RSFSR. It must be viewed as a whole, within the confines of the Union. From the point of view of industrial policy, the distribution of resources, etc. I would not want to make any comparisons here, but with respect to the level of mechanization, the application of fertilizers, resources, and capital investments, the Nonchernozem Region has been lagging behind not only the other regions in the RSFSR, but also the union republics. The amount of fertilizers used, for example, is one-half the amount used, say, by you... But this is not the crux of the matter. The crux of the matter is in finding a way out now. I think that one of these effective ways out is the development of the rental contract and of long-term—or perhaps even no-term—rental. The movement has begun here. People are even coming to the village from the cities now—young people, working people. The social conditions, of course, must be created. It is necessary to carry out housing construction and to develop medicine, but probably the most critical question for the Nonchernozem Region of RSFSR is the question of roads. We are investing a lot of money in land reclamation, but the road management has been neglected. Currently funds for this purpose are being sought. So a few things are being done in this regard. And we have had results. In Kalinin Oblast, in Vladimir Oblast, and in certain others. But they have been uneven.

[Voice] Acts of unrest have been occurring currently in our republic, and the People's Front and and International Front are being created. What is your opinion in this regard?

[V. A. Medvedev] We welcome and support everything that pertains to perestroika and its slogans and tasks. But at the same time there also appear on the crest of that

wave certain unhealthy phenomena, and those are the things that have to be opposed. The healthy process which, in general, has been occurring on the path to perestroika must be used to increase people's active participation. To encourage them to ask more questions, to analyze them, and to take practical part in the decision of matters of all kinds—economic, ecological, etc. But when people of various nationalities begin to oppose one another, that is incorrect. People interpret the situation painfully when various accusations are made against them simply because they belong to the Russian-speaking, nonindigenous population. What does this have to do with them? What are they guilty of? The reasons for the republic's difficulties lie in the fact that many of the economic processes were allowed to develop without any control. It may be that a few people at the top exerted pressure, and the ministries, for example, attempted to bring in people and to build dormitories, but the republic did not oppose that very firmly. And maybe, also, there were very few rights. But now the rights granted to the republics have been expanding. So let's resolve the problems in such a way that they do not give rise to negative consequences in the social or national sphere.

[Voice] It is well known that there exists a noticeable disproportion in the distribution of the budget among Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? How can one explain this?

[V. A. Medvedev] The state budget system requires serious and profound reform. The way I understand it, the income of the republic budget must be formed not so much from appropriations from the top, as from economic interrelations on the republic's territory itself, so that there will be an independent financial base. Then those proportions and percentages will disappear.

[Voice] But for the time being, everything is still being done the old way. It seems to be, for example, that we Latvians are working a little bit better than the others. We also want to live better, but the budget goes to those who, perhaps, do not want to work well. We are losing our incentive to work even better. And there is something else. Why not give an enterprise or a farm the opportunity to use output produced in excess of plan in the way that it wants, for example, the opportunity to barter agricultural produce for manufactured commodities, or vice versa?

[V. A. Medvedev] In principle I agree with you. Much is already being done in this regard. But you are not thinking absolutely correctly. It is necessary for money to regulate the physical products, rather than the other way around. The economic reform is supposed to correct the situation. Everything must proceed through money as a common means of comparison.

[End of question and answer period]

Yet another unplanned meeting with the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee occurred out in the street. The residents of the settlement of Sala had gathered there. Among the slogans supporting the policy of the republic's government, there was also an appeal: "We demand the postponement of the adoption of the draft of the new USSR Constitution." In the course of lively, frank discussion, V. A. Medvedev explained, as he had already done several times during the days of his visit, the substance of the forthcoming restructuring of the state system.

He said:

The first step in this perestroika was taken by the two drafts that have been published in the press: the corrections to the Constitution, and the new electoral law. The appeal that I see here contains a serious inaccuracy. We are currently dealing now the draft of the new Constitution, but only a specific question. The formation of new agencies of state authority.

[Question from young man in the street] My name is Peters Logins. I live here. My history pertains to history. I think that there was an occupation here in 1940. What is your personal attitude toward what occurred then?

[V. A. Medvedev] I do not agree with that. I shall speak outright about it. There was absolutely no occupation. One cannot qualify the events in that way. The question was about whose sphere of influence the Baltic states would be in. There was a threat of German occupation. And that threat became completely real. The 1939 pact with Hitler was, of course, a difficult but a forced step that our country had to take. And for a while it protected the Baltic states from German fascism and enabled the peoples in those states to resolve their own fate. As a whole it was a historically correct decision, and there currently exist no reasons for revising that decision. But let the historians analyze the circumstances concerning this matter. Let them write the appropriate works, which can subsequently be published and discussed.

[Voice] What will be the representative of Latvia, and of every republic, in the Supreme Soviet and in its Presidium?

[V. A. Medvedev] As for the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, it is obvious. The chairman of the Presidium of the union republic will also be a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. And the Supreme Soviet will have a corresponding representation of the union republics, because the Supreme Soviet will consist of two houses that are completely equal and identical in composition. Perhaps a few details and problems have not been regulated here, but they must be discussed and recommendations concerning them must be made. The representation will be in conformity with our well-known principles. There will be no encroachment upon the rights of the union republics, and there will be a

complete observance of their equal rights and sovereignty. If there are no more questions, I wish you success in your work and in your personal life.

[End of meeting in the street]

The secretary of the Central Committee of CPSU Central Committee visited the animal-husbandry complex of the Agrifirm imeni XXV Syezd KPSS.

Ye. N. Trofimov, sector chief of the CPSU Central Committee, also accompanied V. A. Medvedev during his visit to the agrifirm and the conversations that occurred.

**LISSR Second Secretary Mitkin Interviewed**  
*18000169 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian*  
*18 Oct 88 pp 1-2*

[Interview with N.A. Mitkin, LISSR Central Committee's Second Secretary, with TIESA Correspondent M. Barisas: "Perestroyka Is Measured by Actions" under the "TIESA Interview" rubric; first three paragraphs are a boldface introduction]

[Text] We met at a prearranged time and the interview at the office of the LISSR Second Secretary lasted about an hour.

Nikolay Andreyevich Mitkin, having glanced at the list of questions, put the sheet down and asked: "Are these not too personal? By talking about myself I may seem immodest." We explained to him that the newspaper had received letters asking for such an interview.

Below are questions prepared in advance by TIESA correspondent M. Barisas, as well as ones asked in the course of the interview, and N.A. Mitkin's answers.

[Barisas] Many new things have happened lately in the public life of the republic. So we want to begin this interview with an unusual question. You have worked in Lithuania for many years. In the past, however, there never used to be a custom to provide even a cursory report on a leader's life. It is time perhaps to fill this gap. Better late than never, as the saying goes.

[Mitkin] I am not a young man: I will turn 60 next March. I was born to a large peasant family where I was a tenth child. We lived among lumberjacks, workers who float lumber down rivers and fishermen. Cultivated land was scarce in Karelia, so our own corn typically lasted us only six months out of the year. My parents worked in the lumber industry.

Both my mother's and my father's education was limited to three years at a parochial school. I am the only one in my family with a college degree. I graduated from the Karelo-Finnish State University. My field is history. During the Great Patriotic War I was evacuated together with my parents, first to Krasnoyarsk Kray and later,

starting in 1944, to Kirov Oblast. I have seen the deep Siberian taiga and have been in it myself many times. I started working at a kolkhoz very early, while still a small boy, like other wartime kids. At the age of 15 I was working with a lumberjack's ax in hand, and at 16 with a lumber floater's pole. I have known hunger first-hand: during the war, I experienced it in full. Nearly all my relatives perished in the siege of Leningrad.

I worked every summer during my university years, from 1948 to 1953. At that time, we did not have student construction teams. During my fifth year of university I worked as inspector-proofreader at a republican [the Karelo-Finnish SSR] newspaper.

My first encounter with Lithuanian comrades occurred in Leningrad, where I was taking a university course for political science teachers. In Leningrad, I joined the party. I wanted to teach political economy. My roommate was Algirdas Sausanavichyus, who currently works at the Vilnius University. Jonas Anichas, the rector of the Teachers' Institute, also studied there.

I did not have much time to study with professors. I studied for 3 years, but on a part-time basis. I started my career at Karelia's Ministry of Culture. Since March 1957, for over 30 years, I have been a party worker. I was an obkom lecturer, deputy director of the propaganda department and second secretary of the Petrozavodsk party gorkom.

In 1965 I entered the CPSU Central Committee's Academy of Political Sciences. The dean of sciences there was Professor Sergey Shaumyan, the younger son of the famous Baku Commune commissar Stepan Shaumyan, a principled communist and a highly competent specialist, an expert in party history.

I graduated from the Academy in 1968, having defended my Candidate of Sciences' theses titled "The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party under V.I. Lenin's Leadership against Trotskyism in the Period of Reaction and Renewed Revolutionary Fervor". Together with two other students, I wrote a book on the party's struggle against trotskyism before the October Revolution. The book was published by the "Progress" publishing house in English, German, Italian, French and Japanese and earned high praise of reviewers in major party periodicals.

I wanted to devote my entire life to my research. I published some articles in collective monographs. I was a member of the authors' group writing articles for the first volume of the history of the Moscow party organization. But life disposed differently.

For nearly 18 years I worked at the CPSU Central Committee as an instructor at the organizational and party work department, and more recently I headed the Baltic republics and Belorussia section. So I have been



working on the Baltic region for some 20 years. Incidentally, while at the CPSU's Central Committee, I frequently carried out important party missions to Angola and Ethiopia. I have worked with Agostino Netto and Mengistu Haile Miriam. During those years I learned a great deal and met many high-level party officials. I worked on constitutional issues under the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's Candidate Member, USSR Supreme Soviet's First Deputy Chairman A.I. Lukyanov. For a long time I worked under V. Medvedev, currently a member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU's Central Committee.

Two years ago our party sent me to Vilnius, where communists have elected me Second Secretary of the LiSSR Communist Party.

[Barisas] You have said nothing about your marital status.

[Mitkin] My wife and I studied at the same university department. She is also a historian, a teacher. She has worked at school for 30 years. She is a party member. We have a daughter who is also a teacher: she teaches English in Moscow. We have a 7-year old granddaughter. She lives with us in Vilnius and is in the second form.

[Barisas] Some people are quick to talk about privileges of career party officials and their high salaries. What privileges do you have? For example, what kind of apartment do you have?

[Mitkin] I have a 3-room apartment at an ordinary apartment building. To tell you the truth, we asked for a 2-room apartment.

My salary was different at various stages of my life. As a lecturer, I was earning R130 per month. As a gorkom secretary, my salary was R180, at the CPSU Central Committee between R250 and R375. My wife was earning R100-150. I have never used a personal car. A summer house cost me R150 a season. Currently, I belong to the category of highly paid employees with a salary of R560 per month. I think that many heads of farms and organizations earn a considerably higher salary than I do.

In all the years, I have not been able to buy any real estate. I have put together a decent library and I am proud of it. My granddaughter shall inherit it.

[Barisas] During the first month of your posting here, it came out that you were interested in Lithuanian literature and had asked for a Lithuanian-Russian dictionary. Which classics or contemporary authors do you like?

[Mitkin] It is true. Even now I keep dictionaries close by. Yet, the Lithuanian language turned out to be too difficult for me, and at my age it is very hard to learn it. I have practically no time to study it seriously: my day last 12-14 hours, and we work on Saturdays.

I feel that I must read Lithuanian literature since I live in Lithuania, even though I have so little leisure time. Such reading helps understand the soul of the people, its past and present and its aspirations. I am familiar with the work of Kristionas Donelaitis, Mayronis, Eduardas Mezhelaitis, Pyatras Tsvirka and Jonas Avizhyus. I love the poetry of Salomeya Neris. I am especially fond of the poetry of Sergey Esenin, and wartime poems of Konstantin Simonov. Like probably everyone else, I have read with interest such recently popular works as Anatoliy Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" and the works of Dudintsev and Grossman. In NOVYY MIR No.9—I am a subscriber of that journal—I came across a short story by Vladimir Tendryakov which was written in 1974 but published only now. I love books by Russian historians and war memoirs; I own enough such books to fill a full bookshelf. I am attracted to the biography series "Lives of Distinguished People". Incidentally, it is time to suggest to the "Molodaya Gvardiya" publishing house to complement the series with a book on Mikaloyus Konstantinas Chyurlionis [Lithuanian painter and composer]; it would be a very valuable addition to our entire multi-ethnic culture.

[Barisas] Perestroyka fashions a new attitude to the historical heritage of the people and to national culture. What are your thoughts on this?

[Mitkin] National culture is the spirit and the patrimony of the people. It should be cared for; we must preserve everything that the people have created over many centuries. Our duty is to pass it on to our children and grandchildren. It is not enough to follow the development of culture; we must assist the process in every way.

The national consciousness is on the rise and the interest to national culture increases. One must study it and know more about it. This is especially important for the residents of the republic who do not belong to the indigenous nationality. This knowledge encourages communication, brings people closer together and strengthens friendship. This is very important today.

[Barisas] What idea did you have of Lithuania when you first came to work in the republic? Has it changed?

[Mitkin] I did not come here as a complete ignoramus. I had been here before, in Shakyay, Panevezhis and other cities; I once spent two weeks in Kaunas. I knew Antanas Sniechkus, Yuozas Manyushis, Pyatras Grishkyavichus and other leaders of the republic. But one thing is to have a general impression and another to learn about life in the republic first-hand. My knowledge has deepened and broadened, and now I like Lithuania and its people and understand their concerns which have become my own.

[Barisas] The public activity of many people has intensified. Important issues are now discussed at crowded rallies. Various unofficial organizations have sprung up. How do you assess these and other events in public life, what are their positive aspects and do they have some negative ones?

[Mitkin] The perestroika that began in April 1985 impacts all aspects of life, be they economic, political and spiritual. Democratic processes are unfolding, glasnost is gaining momentum, old bans on criticism are being removed and new social and public groups are springing into existence. In Lithuania, the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika is dominant among the latter. I have already expressed my attitude toward the "Sayudis" publicly, in the press. People of different social groups and well-known members of the intelligentsia have joined the "Sayudis". The founding congress will take place soon; it will approve the program and other documents of the Movement for Perestroika. One would like them to be in line with the spirit of the political directives of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, to be constructive and businesslike and to help advance perestroika in the republic.

As in any undertaking, some shortcomings and failures exist. But this can always be corrected. There are mature people working at the "Sayudis", including many communists who will not permit it to deviate from the main path to side roads. The business itself and the issues that have been raised are very serious, and naturally everything should be done in a serious manner. As the CPSU Central Committee and its Secretary General M.S. Gorbachev have stressed many times, the time for marches is over. Today, the most important thing is concrete actions and diligent work to implement everything that has been proposed.

There are many problems, especially in the social sector. The 19th Party Conference selected among them as priority undertakings the Food Program, residential construction, consumer goods production, health care and protection and education reform. The implementation of the social program requires great efforts on the part of the entire nation. No one will do it for us, we will have to do everything with our own hands.

The party's Central Committee and the republic's government fully appreciate how difficult it is to solve these problems, and they make every effort to ensure their successful solution. Many difficulties remain here. We must overcome them at all cost in a joint effort, an effort by the entire nation. The necessary conditions exist, as do the material base and great experience. The most important thing is the skillful, talented hands of our people. This is the guarantee of our success.

[Barisas] The present period is important for grassroots party organizations where reporting and election meetings are being held. What new aspects should be brought out to induce communists to join perestroika more broadly and become its true leaders everywhere?

[Mitkin] The reporting and election campaign at grassroots organizations is coming to an end. In fact, we at the republican communist party's Central Committee see it as a main goal to intensify the activity of grassroots

organizations, since this is where the front line of perestroika lies. It is no accident that a recent Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's plenum was devoted to the work of the primary link of the party. Unfortunately, many unsolved problems remain in this area. Few communists work as well as one would wish, or as our times require. Today, all party workers, members of the Central Committee and of other elected bodies, should be among the masses. The method of managing by remote control is no good today. Everyone must learn to work in a new way, in the conditions of developing democracy and glasnost, and communicate more with the people. This is how our people will understand us better. The times are complex, dangerous and hard. They demand new approaches to issues, prompt actions, competence and profound knowledge of the problems and issues that are put forward by life. These problems can not be solved in the quiet office but only among the people, together with the people and only with the people. There is no alternative.

In a week, rayon and city party conferences will be held. We need a lively, interested and serious discussion on all our issues and problems. There is no place for the drab, cliché-ridden and overly regimented meetings that used to be the norm in the past.

In accordance with the decisions of the 19th Party Conference, the party and the party apparatus are being restructured to get rid of command leadership methods and divide the responsibilities of the soviets and the party organs. Political reform is in the works and the republic's party will be restructured and reorganized. Industry departments are being abolished: only half of existing Central Committee departments will remain. The stress is on organizational and party and ideological work. Those departments will be bolstered. Instead of the currently existing four departments there will be a single, large ideological department.

Party business will be managed by elected bodies. Much work needs to be done to ensure that the Central Committee, raykoms and gorkoms always function with full intensity. To do so, directional committees have been set up at the Central Committee that will be headed by Central Committee secretaries. There are plans to establish such committees at gorkoms and raykoms.

[Barisas] What other issues would you like to stress, what other problems should be addressed?

[Mitkin] Perestroika is a complex process. It was not meant to happen in one day. As life has shown, it can not be implemented by a cavalry assault. We will need time. The process of renewal has been difficult. Some forces even in our republic do not take well to changes: they prefer holding meetings, spread rumors and attach labels rather than do diligent, concrete work.

Everyone must clearly comprehend that democracy and glasnost are not anarchy and permissiveness. Democracy

and law and democracy and discipline are inseparable concepts existing only as a unity. Otherwise there can be no perestroika that has been initiated by the party. The party implements perestroika, leads it and directs it. Today, to achieve perestroika's crucial goals, we more than ever need the party to close its ranks and stand together; we need combat actions by all communists and unity of our entire people. All social forces must rally around the party. This is the only path to success and to continued growth of the republic's productive forces and the welfare of the people.

[Barisas] Thank you for your answers.

### **Lithuania Views Independent Economic Ties to West**

#### **Contacts With US Banks, Businesses**

18000213a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
21 Oct 88 p 3

[ELTA report: "Direct Contacts: Lithuania-USA"]

[Text] The consumer's table needs larger and larger quantities of well-prepared, ecologically pure, attractively packaged agricultural produce. Although in this area Lithuania is prospering on a countrywide scale and can even serve as an example to other republics, unresolved problems do exist.

Recently Gennadiy Konoplev, first deputy chairman of Gosagroprom, and LISSR minister, visited the United States. He discussed the purpose and results of that trip with ELTA correspondent D. Ruchinskas.

Obviously, the time has come when it is no longer sufficient for us to orient ourselves on the union level. We must know how we look alongside of such countries as Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and Sweden. Our goal is to achieve a situation in which our citizens obtain only high-grade food products. The primary thing that we did in the United States was to look for ways to resolve this problem as quickly as possible. The first condition is obtaining imported equipment and production technology. The Union does not have this kind of equipment or these technological schemes. I was personally convinced of that when I analyzed this question at all the union administrative levels. Meanwhile the promises made by the appropriate union departments that they would manufacture this equipment are unfortunately being fulfilled unsatisfactorily.

Thus, during my trip to the United States, using as a middleman the Albert International Corporation, the president of which is Simon Volonskiy, who was born in Lithuania, I had the opportunity to meet with U.S. bankers and to discuss what real aid they could render to Lithuania in resolving this problem. I managed to meet Edward Svimens III, the president of a bank association. U.S. business circles are ready to give Lithuania aid, with the proviso that we will resolve the questions in a

nonstandard way. They refuse to resolve the questions through the union associations that currently are engaged in export and import. The reasons are well-known: the large bureaucratic mechanism; the fact that it takes years to conclude contracts; and the fact that it takes 3-4 years for the shipments to begin. This does not satisfy either our own needs or those of U.S. businessmen. During the conversations we came to the conclusion that we can have mutually advantageous contracts only if we evaluate three conditions. First, the republic must have an independent account and independent settlement with foreign companies, including settlement by means of Category I currency, that is, dollars. Second, the republic must be completely independent in the area of shipping output. Third, we must not be regulated or limited by an export plan or by limitations of other material resources. After these three conditions have been carried out, we will be granted long-term credit in foreign currency for the purchase of equipment with the aid of which we can manufacture the output and make settlements with the foreign companies. I think that this is very profitable and very good cooperation. It is economically profitable for both parties. Practically speaking, this would lead us out of our backwardness. In order to carry out these goals, we signed with the Albert International Corporation, and with its president, Simon Volonskiy, in the United States a protocol that stipulates the establishment, under Gosagroprom, of an association that operates under a system of cost accountability and that is supposed to carry out the three conditions mentioned. Thus, that company assumed the role of guarantor in matters involving U.S. banks. This is one aspect of the question. In addition, that company would represent Lithuania practically throughout the Western world and would engage in all our affairs.

Then we analyzed the directions in which we could work with that company and in which the U.S. businessmen would invest their capital. The following directions are assumed: production of fruit drinks, champagne, and certain other beverages; export of articles made of wood, export of high-grade meat, and of certain types of fruits and vegetables grown in hothouses. The considerable development of the fur trade and the manufacture of articles from fur is also assumed. A second protocol was signed with regard to these questions. It lists the enterprises that can conclude contracts with the companies. These are nine enterprises and farms, including the Utena Soft-Drinks Combine; the Alitus Experimental Home-Building Combine; the Klaypeda Meat Processing Plant; the Panevezhis Interfarm Animal-Husbandry Enterprise; the Kaunas Confectionery Factory; the Vilnius Hothouse Combine; and other collectives. They have already begun practical work with the foreign companies. All the agreements are extremely important. In order to carry them out in practice, it is necessary to break the mechanism that is currently functioning in relations with foreign countries. Administrators of the LISSR Council of Ministers approved the signed agreements and promised to provide all kinds of support by acting as middlemen at the union administrative levels.



**Brazauskas on Finnish, Scandinavian Contacts**  
*18000213b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian*  
*25 Oct 88 p 1*

[ELTA item: "Interview For Foreign Television"]

[Text] Vilnius, 24 October (ELTA). A. Brazauskas, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, gave an interview today to journalists from Norway, Finland, and Sweden, who were participating in the constituent congress of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement.

In answering the questions, Comrade A. Brazauskas remarked that Sayudis had been born thanks to the program proclaimed by the party—the program for the renovation of Soviet society—and thanks to the reforms being carried out in our country. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee essentially supports this public movement that is striving for positive changes in economic and spiritual life.

There was also a discussion concerning the expansion of contacts with Finland and the Scandinavian countries. Large opportunities for this have appeared at the present time.

**Official Resistance to Talaka Society Noted**  
*18120038 Moscow VEK XXI MIR in Russian*  
*No 7, 88 p 5*

[Article by Alesya Semukha entitled: "Potential of Regional Movements"]

[Text] Reading the article "The Barricades of Perestroika" published in your magazine, I noticed that perestroika content is undergoing renewal as new forces are being drawn into it. One of them is ethnic and regional public movements which exist in many regions, Byelorussia including.

The Talaka association set up with the aim of helping restorers, by young writers, students and workers in 1985 is a proof of emerging new social interests. Later Talaka began to pay more attention to wider ecological problems such as ecology of culture and development of friendly contacts with cultural and ecological movements of Soviet Republics.

Such regional cooperation resulted in a joint march of Byelorussian and Latvian ecological clubs along the Dvina River in April-May 1987 against ecologically ill-considered construction of the Daugavpils Hydropower Station. We think this march, which attracted attention of scientists and public to the problems of ecology in the region, influenced, to a certain extent, the decision to stop the construction, passed by the Council of Ministers of the Latvian Republic. May 1988 has seen the joint Byelorussian-Ukrainian march along the Pripyat River, devoted to the solution of the whole complex of problems faced by the Byelorussian-Ukrainian Polesiye area, including problems connected with land improvement in the basin of the Pripyat River.

We think of the great importance to take into consideration the public interests in the Byelorussian as well as Ukrainian Polesiye areas. The way this problem is put is a distinctive feature of our movement.

Objective existence of ecological problems, concerning the region as a whole, is confirmed by more active ethnic and cultural movement in the Byelorussian regions of Poland. The First Congress of Byelorussian Students, held in Belostok last past spring, declared the need for regional cultural contacts between Byelorussians in Poland and in Byelorussia. It so happened that Polish Byelorussians became initiators of interstate cultural and ethnic contacts stating the need for cultural cooperation with the youth organizations of the Byelorussian Republic. We think that the contacts to form a union of amateur democratic association are a major component of new political thinking and transition to new civil diplomacy. We and our colleagues in Poland believe that it is impossible to solve ecological problems without cooperation between peoples in strengthening peace.

Establishing our foreign contacts we rely on the Byelorussian Peace Committee from which we have not yet received any help: ideology of the stagnation period is a serious obstacle to mutual understanding between state bodies and Talaka.

The attitude of the Byelorussia's Komsomol Central Committee regarding Talaka is dual. Cooperation and aid in words on the part of the Komsomol frequently end in an attempt to place the movement under its control. The Republican press is unfriendly to an idea of ethnic and cultural revival. Many publications dealing with the activity of the association and some of its members have a strong smack of Nina Andreyeva's notorious article dated 13 March 1988 and contain unfounded accusations of nationalism. Obviously not all pressmen can understand the difference between ethnic, cultural, regional, peace-keeping and nationalistic associations.

Future of perestroika depends on the fullest possible utilization of its potential, the drawing of broad masses into the revolutionary transformations of our society. A considerable reserve of perestroika are democratic, ethnic, regional, ecological and cultural movements.

**Journalist Poznyak on Stalinist Atrocities at Kuropaty**  
*18120025 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English*  
*No 41, 16-23 Oct 88 p 16*

[Article by Zenon Poznyak entitled: "Kuropaty: A National Tragedy That Everyone Should Know About"]

[Text] Early in 1937 Karol Kononovich, a forest ranger, discovered some disorder in the forest: somebody had dug pits in the earth, had filled them in and planted pine

trees on them. But the pine trees had withered. A peasant's bag hung forgotten on a nearby tree. Inside were bread and sausage. The ranger ran off to the rural Soviet to phone "where one should phone". This so-and-so speaking, he reported. From the receiver came a metallic voice: "Look less keenly if you wish to remain alive." Kononovich understood it all very well. And a little later a high (taller than three metres) fence of boards, topped with barbed wire, appeared in the forest. From behind it one could hear shots—round the clock and at all seasons—and shouts, wails, pleas, dog's howling and the purring of automobile motors.

That was how this fearsome place (some 10-15 hectares in area) originated not so far from Minsk. Its traditional name was Brod, or Kuropaty. It was a place where people were shot on a mass scale. It was a "murder-place" which operated every day—from 1937 to June 1941.

Such "murder-places" were near other large cities in Byelorussia, too. By questioning witnesses, five major places of mass extermination of people at the time of Stalin's repressions were found (to date) in Minsk and its environs alone.

#### Hiding the Signs

The villages Tsna-Yodkova, Drozdovo, Zelyony Lug and Zelyonovka and isolated homesteads were located around Kuropaty at a distance of 1.5-2.5 km. My colleague Yevgeny Shmygalyov and I had a chance to hear in the 1970s the stories told by the long-timers in the place about the details of the murders. The peasants' daily life went on to the crackle of shots. Sometimes they even tried—when harvesting wheat or planting potatoes—to count the killed: a shot per person. "Our hands dropped and we couldn't work," sighed the storytellers. "The entire village lived in terror. For five years, due to the shooting, we couldn't sleep at night," said Roman Batsyan (born in 1913), an old resident of Tsna.

Yevgeny Shmygalyov and I conducted a methodical poll in 1987-1988 of dozens of witnesses (some 170 have been found) and did archaeological diggings of the burials in Kuropaty. As a result of the work, we wrote an article that was published on June 3 by the Republican newspaper LITARATURA I MASTATSTVA. I'll briefly cite the main facts and conclusions of our research. The people were shot after dinner, towards the evening and all throughout the night. The doomed people were brought in vans, were shot by groups with Nagant revolvers and thrown into deep pits. The murders wore NKVD uniforms. After a group of people were shot, the dead bodies were slightly covered with sand, and the next group was brought—until the pit was full.

As a result of our research and archaeological digging, we found out that in the 40s, already after the war, all the graves in Kuropaty were subjected to exhumation. Some of the witnesses said that soldiers "potted about" there. Who was it that needed to dig up the dead bodies

secretly and swiftly? Where were the remains taken? Who was trying to "cover the traces"? We posed these questions in the article. It turned out that lots of traces were left. Our digging showed that the exhumation had been carried out carelessly. We found the remains of those executed at the bottom of the pits which were quite deep—some 3 metres. We found dozens of skulls shot through, leather and rubber footwear made in the USSR (the trademarks on the galoshes show 1937 and 1938), shells from a Soviet revolver, buttons, purses with Soviet coins of the 30s, eyeglasses, china and enamel mugs, a toothbrush made by a factory in Vietbsk, etc.

#### Investigation Has Started

The publication of the article was preceded by the resistance of what we now call the "braking forces". However, the newspaper stood up well to the pressure. The article did appear in LITARATURA I MASTATSTVA, though in a somewhat abridged version.

A government commission "to corroborate the facts described in the article" was set up two weeks after the publication. And the History Institute of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences received the following letter from the Byelorussian Procurator's Office: "The BSR Procurator's Office is investigating a criminal case involving the discovery of forest graves on the territory of the Borovlyansky Rural Soviet, the Minsk District. It is necessary to exhume the remains in order to determine the circumstances surrounding the interments. Guided by Article 44 of the BSSR Code of Criminal Procedure, we request assistance. Please delegate an Institute staff member—an archaeology expert—to take part in the selective exhumation."

That was how the digging (it was done on July 6-15) was undertaken by an investigation group of the BSSR Procurator's Office, led by Ya. Brolishs, investigator of specially important cases attached to the BSSR Procurator, on the one hand, and, on the other, archaeologists from the staff of the History Institute of the BSSR Academy of Sciences—my colleagues N. Krivaltsevich (research associate), O. Iov (postgraduate student) and myself.

We made 7 digs to a maximum depth of 2.75 m and totaling 44 sq m in area.

The research was done in the presence of witnesses, protocols, diary entries and general measurements were kept, photos and video tape recordings were made; several news teams made films of the work, TV and newspaper people and several members of the government commission were present. After the field work was over the research data was analyzed and generalized, drawings were made (plans, profiles, crosscuts of the excavations, etc.), conclusions were drawn, and a research report was prepared which was discussed and

approved by the general meeting of the Archaeology Department. A copy of the report has been handed over to the BSSR Procurator's Office.

### Proofs

Bulletholes were discovered in nearly all the skulls that were found (312 in all), as a rule in the back of the head, quite often two and even three holes. There were also side holes and holes from behind—"under the skull". Some of the victims may have put up resistance and in such cases the shooting was done unsystematically (but then, this could also be an expression of the different "styles" of the killers).

Mikolai Karpovich (b. 1919), a resident of Tsna, one of the witnesses, who at that time was 18 years old, managed to see something absolutely exceptional—the doomed people being shot with rifles. They were also shot in groups, but not in the back of the head. They stood up in a row before the pit, each one was gagged and blindfolded. Then a murderer came up "from the flank" and fired point blank at the head of the edge-person, bringing down two people with one shot. "As they fired," Karpovich says, "two people at once fell into the pit. They were saving bullets." It was a sort of a bravado, a sport, a demonstration of professionalism. Some 200 empty shells from a Soviet Nagant revolver and one from a TT pistol were found. Dozens of bullets were discovered, some of them inside the skulls. The diameters of the shells, bullets and the bullet holes in the skulls coincide.

The majority of skulls have large (up to 5-6 cm in diameter) lacerated holes in the foreheads, temples or tops. This shows that the Nagant muzzle was stuck close to the back of the head: after the shot the powder gases under pressure followed the bullet into the skull and out through the hole it made. Some residents of the neighbouring villages said that very often on Saturdays people from the forest, dressed in NKVD uniforms, would come at about 11 p.m. (apparently after their work shift) to the village dances.

What shocked me most of all during the digging—not as a researcher but as a human being—was the great number of women buried. Women's skulls and belongings were found in all the graves.

### How Many Were Buried There?

We managed to reveal the geography and the chronology of the burials in Kuropaty. The shootings started in the territory's eastern part. The graves there are dated 1937-1938. The dig-ups revealed things and objects exclusively of Soviet make, and a lot of self-made or artisan footwear. Very few toilet articles. It all shows that it was mainly local residents that were buried here. This is confirmed by the letters I got from Mikol Rymarev (b. 1927) from Bobruisk, in which he makes an attempt to recollect the names of the hundreds of his co-villagers

who died in those four years. At the beginning of the 1930s his Selivonovka village had 120 houses, over 800 villagers. At the outset of the 40s, before the war, there were less than 30 houses left. Several people—the collective farm chairman, the rural Soviet chairman, a team leader and a couple of their henchmen—terrorized the entire population. The point is that the informer was immediately paid for each "enemy" revealed—a certain sum in cash from the special NKVD fund (some 15 roubles per man in today's currency). The judahs from Selivonovka always drank after selling one more co-villager and even composed a song about their "deeds" which they sang during the bouts.

The majority of those buried in Kuropaty were not of high social status. The No 1 grave was filled in, most probably, in winter: a lot of winter clothing was found in it.

Further east and south-eastwards are the interments of 1939 and later. Mainly people from Western Byelorussia lie there. Most of all things of "intellectual" use were found in grave No 5—many accessories, eyeglasses, a monocle, pince-nez, medicines, etc. The footwear there was of high quality, factory-made or custom-made especially for the wearer, women's high-heeled boots, gloves, etc.

From the things found in the graves and from the fact that some of them (like clothes and footwear) were found neatly folded, from the presence of food, purses, etc., we may conclude that the people were preparing for some trip, that they had left their homes not long before they were shot, and had not been kept in jail before they were shot. This makes one think that they were "liquidated"—to use the term then used—without a trial.

After making the necessary measurements, calculations and after summing up all the data, we can approximate the initial (before the exhumation of the 40s) number of people buried in the investigated graves. If we take the average number of corpses—200 per grave—and simply multiply it by the number of graves found to date (510)—we'll get 102,000 people. However, the real number of victims must be bigger. In addition, in March-May 1988 some 100 (if not more) graves were filled up and then leveled over by bulldozers when a gas main was being laid and the forest around it cut down. Many graves disappeared when the ring road was being laid in the early 50s—late 60s, and maybe in the 40s, too, when afforestation work was done in the area. The graves to the south of the ring road, where the southern border of the "murder-places" was, have still not been taken into account.

When you hear the witnesses' accounts of this gory horror story, when you see with your own eyes the evidence and the remains, when you're in a pit in the ground together with dead bodies, when you recognize tableware that you remember from your childhood and other utensils, scattered among the bones, the familiar rubber women's shoes (which I remember my mother wore in her youth), when you pull out from under skulls



with bullet holes the light as flax, long strands of women's hair, like the hair you used to see in the morning on a woman when you see all this, and experience the smell of decay in the blossoming forest full of singing of birds (I don't mention here how physiologically difficult the digging was), when you see all this—you are at real loss for words. You can't find any. You're numb.

In conclusion, I want to share two thoughts concerning the aforementioned shootings. The first is that no one will now be able to hide the truth about Kuropaty. The second is that every honest individual must fight Stalinism—that evil, lying, cruel, anti-human phenomenon.

### **Academician on Stalinist-Imposed Famine in Ukraine**

18000218 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
16 Oct 88 p 3

[Article by S. Kulchitskiy, doctor of historical sciences: "A Tragedy Which Might Not Have Happened"]

[Text] What was the primary cause of the famine of 1933, and how many people perished from it?—P. Tolstoy.

The famine of 1933 is a burning wound in the memory of an entire generation. Yet historians could not speak about this tragedy for a long time. First because Stalin—one of those responsible for it—took all measures to see that it was treated as a phenomenon which supposedly never existed. In January of 1933 he announced pointedly: "We have undoubtedly achieved the fact that the material position of our workers and peasants is improving from year to year. Only staunch enemies of Soviet authority can doubt this fact". Who wanted to become a staunch enemy?

Of course, after the exposure of the cult of personality the situation began to change. However, the ideological taboo placed on this page of history remained in force. After all, its rescission would touch upon too great a strata of old principles and conceptions, and glasnost and the bare truth had not yet become the leading principles of life at that time.

The radical changes in our society, whose inception were laid by the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, made it possible to study this "blank spot", which we might sooner call black.

Turning to this period, it is necessary to see that the rise in food supply problems began even earlier. Already in 1929 a card system of food distribution to the urban population had been introduced. In the winter of 1931-1932 in many rural rayons, including also in the Ukraine, difficulties with food supply grew into hunger. This was openly discussed at the 3rd All-Ukrainian Party Conference in July of 1932 (the speeches were published

in the newspapers). In the winter months of 1932-1933 the hunger grew into a famine which by the spring had taken on catastrophic proportions.

The scope of the hunger undoubtedly increased due to Stalin's decision to conduct grain procurement in the winter of 1932-33. In November of 1932 he sent extraordinary procurement commissions to Kharkov, Saratov and Rostov-on-Don with the task of taking grain at any cost. It is specifically the instances of activity of these commissions (blockade of villages and entire regions, household searches with seizure of food reserves, displacement of peasants to the northern rayons with confiscation of their property, etc.) which in the West substantiate the opinion about the artificial character of this famine. Undoubtedly, the seizures of food reserves from the kolkhozes and individuals with the greatest debt in grain procurements which were performed by the commissions worsened the situation, but were they really the cause of the misfortune?

In the Ukraine the extraordinary commission acted under the leadership of V. M. Molotov. In 3 months, from November 1932 to January 1933 in the peasant sector (kolkhozes and individuals) 89.5 million poods of grain were procured. In the next 3 months (February-April), when the procurement was discontinued, 34.3 million poods of grain returned to the republic in the form of seed, fodder, and food loans. Thus, the commission in actuality took away 55.2 million poods, i.e., a little over 2 poods for each of the 25 million rural residents of the Ukraine. Let us compare this figure with the 6-month (until the new harvest) food fund, which according to minimal evaluation was equal to 8 poods per person and 200 million poods for the entire rural population. From such a comparison it follows that the cessation of procurements in October of 1932 would not have prevented the famine. In other words, the reasons for the famine cannot be sought in the activity of the extraordinary commissions.

There was one reason for the famine: the degradation of agriculture caused by the surplus-appropriation system imposed on the kolkhozes. It became the result of inept economic policy, which led to the decline of kolkhoz production and became an inevitable consequence of the adventuristic effort of Stalin to fulfill the 5-year plan in 3 years by methods of military assault.

What was the nature of the blow dealt by the famine of 1933? The data on losses preserved in the archives are episodic. Evidently, complete data simply do not exist, because of the reason which we indicated at the beginning of this article. Therefore, in determining losses we must rely on rather imprecise calculated data.

The all-union census conducted in January of 1937 showed that in the Ukraine, in Kazakhstan, Povolzhye, in the Northern Caucasus, i.e., in the regions most affected by the hunger, there was a significantly lower population than expected. When the results of the census

were given to Stalin, the census organizers were accused of under-counting and repressed, and the census materials were destroyed. Yet a repeat census which was conducted in January of 1939 also indicated a shortage of people in the rayons affected by the famine. Specifically, in the Ukraine there were 941,000 fewer people than at the beginning of 1933. This was also in view of the fact that there was a high natural population growth due to the banning of abortions.

The computations based on the census of 1939 do not give a satisfactory answer, since it was greatly influenced by the mass repressions of 1937-1938. However, we have in our possession data on the population numbers in the republics and oblasts for January of 1937, which by some miracle were preserved. Even before the results of the '37 census were destroyed, these data were requisitioned from the statistical organs of the elections commissions by the USSR Supreme Soviet and placed in its archive funds.

According to computations, the total natural population growth for 1933-36 should have comprised 1,783,000 persons in the Ukraine. In fact there was an apparent deficit of 1,744,000 people as compared with the beginning of 1933. Thus, the republic was underpopulated by over 3.5 million people. Of this number, several hundred thousand may be related to repressive displacement, but the main portion comprised the victims of the '33 famine.

#### **Azerbaijani Researcher Predicts Ecological 'Death Sentence' for Caspian**

18300106a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian  
10 Sep 88 p 3

[Article by A. Kasymov, AzSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, recorded by A. Nikolsky, under the "Man and Nature" rubric: "Caspian Dead Zones"; first two paragraphs are BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY introduction. Passages in boldface as published]

[Text] Today, the fate of the Caspian Sea troubles scientists, specialists and broad strata of society. Under the influence of economic pressure, this unique reservoir is on the verge of destruction.

Is there a solution to the situation which has taken shape, and what must be done to return life-giving forces to it? We asked A. Kasymov, AzSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, to answer these and other questions. He has written a number of serious studies on the biology of the Caspian Sea.

There was a time when scientists' works on the Caspian remained topical for many decades—the physical and biological parameters of the sea were so stable. Now, even immediately published works on this subject do not always correspond to the actual state of affairs. Last year my monograph "*Kaspiyskoye More*" [The Caspian Sea], devoted to the biology of this remarkable reservoir, was

published in Leningrad. Today, many of its theses have already become obsolete. The situation in the Caspian is changing not in terms of days, but of hours, and for the worse.

I have been studying the Caspian for a long time and know its ancient, historical past and its quite recent past, memorable not only to me, but also to people of my generation. A terrible fate has fallen to our sea in the 20th century. We can well see the causes, and we can explain and understand a great deal. However, who will take the responsibility for the callous attitude toward the Caspian from us, and how will we justify ourselves for what has happened in front of our children and future generations? When I tell my children that even in the 1940s it was possible to fish for (kutum), herring and carp in Baku Bay, I notice not only surprise, but also mute reproach in their eyes.

Today there is nothing alive in the bay. It has become a dead zone, and more and more such zones are appearing. They extend for many kilometers along Apsheron and encompass the entire bank near Sumgait. They also exist in the southern areas and even in the middle of the sea. In the Oil Rocks area, fishermen used to catch up to 15,000 centners of pike-perch. Now, pike-perch have entirely disappeared here. A dead zone. The reason is obvious: the sea has been poisoned with petroleum wastes.

It is impossible to think that scientists and specialists did not fight for the Caspian. At the very beginning of its development, there were heated debates at different levels: what should be given preference—the oil or the sea? Then, a powerful leader in the oil refining industry said approximately the following: "It may be that 'black gold' does not even exist below the bottom of the Caspian. However, all the same I will not turn back. It is needed as a proving ground, on which a broad-scale assault on the deposits of the entire shelf region of our country will be readied."

This was the determining statement. The decision was made to combine the uncombinable—to extract oil and to take care of the sea. Perhaps, in the future, given the effective and proper solution of all technical problems, such a combination will be possible. Today, it has become a catastrophe. The fact is that no one took the main thing into account: the Caspian is a closed reservoir. Thus, it is far more difficult for it to solve biological self-purification problems, than it is for the Pacific Ocean.

To put it directly: the sea is being suffocated by oil and other polluting substances. At this time, the various ministries and departments, which handle their own prestigious regional tasks, are once again reporting an increase in the extraction of oil and gas. One could reconcile oneself to this, if they had also reported on protective, nature-preserving work. However, after all, they do virtually nothing in this area. Let me add that,

proceeding from the prospects outlined by them for the next 15 years, the Azerbaijan and Turkmen banks will be developed even more intensively. This definitively undermines the fishing importance of the Caspian. It was emphasized that part of the feeding area, encompassing a total of about 30,000 square kilometers, will be lost! This means that yet another dead zone will appear. Due to the reduction in feeding areas alone, annual losses of sturgeon comprise 115,000 centners and, in terms of price, this is a loss of 10 million rubles. It seems, if some of this money was made available to the oil workers for better technical and technological support of the deposits, the benefits would be far greater than they are from obtaining oil and gas under the very complex conditions of the Caspian. Really, our hydrocarbon raw materials are not becoming gold, but, in truth, diamonds.

Unfortunately, we are essentially treading in place in solving the cardinal problems of the Caspian. In front of me is a supposedly promising document, approved by the AzSSR Academy of Sciences Presidium—the "Interdepartmental Program for Basic and Applied Research on the Development of Natural Resources of the Caspian Sea in the Interests of the AzSSR National Economy for 1987-1990." Anyone having glanced at it would see that many trivial projects have been planned, related, for example, to studying the accumulation of natural and artificial substrates in the construction region for new petroleum industry installations, studying the influence of metals on shrimp in the Southern Caspian, etc.

Although the program is called interdepartmental, in terms of content it has a clearly narrow, departmental nature. The Caspian must be studied according to a unified, integral, interrelated comprehensive program with clearly defined final tasks. Geologists, biologists, hydrologists, biochemists, physiologists and geographers should work on this program hand in hand.

The Scientific Research Institute for Zoology, where I work, was made the head organization for the competitors in the program. Nevertheless, I can state with full responsibility that my competence is highly restricted for the most part. It would have been logical to entrust the implementation of this program to the Scientific Council for Problems of the Caspian Sea. However, doing this would have meant letting matters drift. After all, for many years the council has only existed on paper. It turns out that the sole working agency which would be able to head and coordinate scientific research on the Caspian is inactive. In the briefest period of time, we must revive the council and invest it with specific rules and serious responsibilities.

Right now, I will deal with the problems of the Caspian's biology. It is possible to say that it has been studied sufficiently. Thanks to this, we have taken and are taking practical steps which, even under extreme conditions, make it possible to enrich the sea with living organisms.

In the 1940s and 1950s, on the suggestion of biologists, certain representatives of the fauna of the Black and Azov seas were re-settled in the Caspian, and they have become an excellent food for sturgeon. Scientists have developed and extensively introduced the artificial breeding of valuable species of young fish, which are subsequently released into the sea. Today, we have completed studies related to colonizing sandy, uninhabited and other unproductive zones of the Caspian with mollusks from the Sea of Azov. This should also have a positive effect on replenishing the supply of food for commercial fish.

However, unfortunately, the negative anthropogenic influence on the Caspian is developing so extensively and swiftly that we scientists simply are not managing to practically oppose it with something significant and effective. Let us consider the oil and petrochemical industry wastes released into the Caspian. Complex in terms of their structure, they instantly violate the biological balance and disrupt the clearly laid out system of interrelations among the sea inhabitants. We have no resources whatsoever against this.

Meanwhile, we have nothing to set against wastes carried out from our fields by the irrigation canals. They carry salts and all sorts of toxic substances. Now, even the Kura is no longer a moving water artery, but just another disposal canal, in which everything that agricultural land is fertilized with ends up, as a result of the filtration of irrigators and the direct flow of rain water from fields. The fish do not recognize the "scent" of the Kura and do not go to it for spawning.

Now, let us consider some of the results of man's intensive work in the Caspian Basin. Today, about 3.5 million centners of fish are harvested in its waters. Of this volume, the share of valuable species was 0.8 million centners, but that of sprat was 2.7 million. For comparison, let us recall that the Caspian yielded more than 6 million centners of fish, mostly valuable species, in the 1930s. The violation of the biological balance has led to the fact that the catches of lamprey, carp, chub and white-eye at the mouth of the Kura has stopped in general. The catches of herring, pike-perch, bream and vobla in the Caspian have reduced by a factor of 20. However, the sea has not yet died. For the time being, it lives and still has reserve areas for a food base. Taking this into account, the scale of artificial fish-breeding for valuable species could be doubled, giving preference to sea-trout, sturgeon, herring and fish caught in nets.

From year to year, the flow of river waters into the Caspian is reduced. However, economic leaders continue to build new canals, taking this most valuable liquid away from the rivers, and thus from the Caspian as well. The construction of a second Volga-Don Canal has begun. The Volga-Chogray, as well as the Oka-Don-Oskol Canals contribute their share to this dirty business. This is all equivalent to signing a death sentence for the Caspian.



I really do not want to end this discussion on such a hopeless note. However, what can one do? For the time being, goal-oriented work to save the Caspian has not been started—there is no cause whatsoever for optimism.

**UzSSR: Medical Official on Pesticide Abuse  
Threat to Public Health**

18300106b Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian  
9 Sep 88 p 1

[Interview by UzTAG correspondent Yu. Kruzhilin with Boris Ilich Yusupov, head, Department of Pesticide Use Hygiene, republic Sanitation and Epidemiological Center, UzSSR Ministry of Health, under the "Topical Interview" rubric: "Defoliation Through the Eyes of a Doctor. Value Number One—Not the "Plan at any Cost." But the Health of the Agricultural Laborer", passages in boldface as published]

[Text] [Kruzhilin] These days, when defoliation has started in Uzbekistan cotton fields, the first and most painful question is about butyphos. A local writer with a penchant for talking to correspondents from the central press stated in SOBESEDNIK (No 12 for 1988) that the republic's population continues to be poisoned by this toxic defoliant, even though its use has been banned. If this is true, it is then a question of a great failure in the work of our sanitation and epidemiological service. Is this so?..

[Yusupov] This is not true. Not a single drop of butyphos was sprayed on the fields of Uzbekistan last year, nor has it happened this year.

However, the leaders of individual farms in Samarkand, Syr-Darya and Tashkent Oblasts, as well as several workers at UzSSR Gosagroprom, have attempted to use this preparation, which was forbidden by the USSR chief sanitation inspector in March 1987. We no longer permit, even for so-called exceptions, the use of butyphos which, as science has already proved, causes great harm to the health of all who work in the cotton fields or live near them.

[Kruzhilin] Nevertheless, the problem of protecting people from the harmful effects of the chemicals used in agriculture remains urgent. What is being done in this regard to improve the republic's ecological situation?

[Yusupov] Firstly, crop-spraying has been sharply reduced by converting to the surface processing of plantations. Secondly, less toxic preparations are being used for defoliation: magnesium chlorate, calcium chlorate-chloride, UDM and a number of others.

Incidentally, even here there are some "buts." It is important that unfounded tranquillity does not arise in the use of these defoliants by "Uzselkhozkhimiya" and by the farms themselves. They are all poisons. If the established procedures are violated, they are just as harmful.

[Kruzhilin] Are there examples of such violations?

[Yusupov] Yes, last year the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin in Kattakurganskiy Rayon defoliated by airplane in direct proximity to the homes of kolkhoz workers. After the investigation of this case, the republic SES [Sanitation and Epidemiological Center] chairman and the farm's agronomist-entomologist were penalized, and materials on the pilots from the Samarkand Aviation Subdivision were sent to the prosecutor's office.

Another more serious case occurred in Kashka-Darya Oblast, where the fixed dosage of magnesium chlorate was exceeded. The cotton, sent from here to the Alma-Ata Cotton Combine, caused eye and skin illnesses and allergic reactions among the combine workers. A study by the oblast SES revealed the same "qualities" in production at the Kasanskiy Cotton Plant.

These are the fruits of a still-persisting slipshod approach and the disregard of rules. We poison ourselves, then we complain to the "authorities," who allegedly forcibly spread the excessive use of chemicals... Checks by the republic and local SESs have shown that defoliants and other chemical pesticides are stored directly at the agricultural airfields in Payarykskiy, Pastdargomskiy, and Kattakurganskiy Rayons, in field camps without protection. The residues are not cleaned up. Storage places are not decontaminated, and the packaging is not destroyed.

[Kruzhilin] However, there are now fewer such airfields...

[Yusupov] The surface method also requires discipline. The republic Gosagroprom still has not solved the problems of decontaminating tractor sprayers. They are washed by the banks of canals and in irrigation ditches: special areas have not been designated. The population then drinks water from these irrigation canals... Herds graze by the banks, which creates an additional danger: the poison gets into animal meat.

Moreover, in the current season, according to reports from local areas, Gosagroprom had planned to defoliate by airplane in densely populated areas such as Andizhan, Khorezm and Fergan oblasts. However, after all, it is undoubtedly impossible to provide a sanitation-protective zone there: it must be no fewer than 1,000 meters away from any residential building, and 2,000 meters away from water canals and fishing ponds!

The republic Ministry of Health sent the strict instructions to the local areas: violations of these protective zones will not be tolerated in any case whatsoever. Incidentally, surface machines are not allowed any closer than 300 meters to a residence. The use of airplanes and sprayers with faulty equipment will be forbidden. Materials on the guilty parties will be sent to the prosecutor's office. We are hoping for active cooperation from local residents, communists, Komsomol members, people's controllers and sprayer operators.

[Kruzhilin] Agricultural chemicals can be dangerous not only when used, but also when improperly stored. Do you take this into account?

[Yusupov] Absolutely. Last year, 350 pesticide storage sites were closed for failure to observe sanitation rules, pesticide use was forbidden in 37 farms, and 632 fines were levied. A number of cases were sent to the prosecutor's office. These figures indicate the scale of continuing violations. Similar events should not be repeated: after all, there are more new illnesses of adults and children for every violation.

[Kruzhilin] How do our agricultural industry and "Selkhozkhimiya" react to the work of the sanitation service?

[Yusupov] Alas, not as actively as they should... It is time to realize that work should be evaluated not according to the quantity of pesticides used, but the harvest. There is still no strict inventorying of the chemical substances being used. Chemical centers which meet sanitation standards and safety requirements are not being built.

We can no longer reconcile ourselves to the disorderly storage and use of pesticides, not only for defoliation, but also for other kinds of work with chemicals. Meanwhile, little is changing. Regardless of the direct instruction from the republic government, active work to replace the use of chemicals with plant biodefense has still not been developed. Last year, the use of pesticides not only failed to decline, but increased by 15,000 tons. The toxic chemical content in the soil in the cotton-growing regions of Uzbekistan is higher than the average for the country by a factor of 5-6.

[Kruzhilin] However, after all, is this not a direct threat to people's health?

[Yusupov] It is indeed. Studies by Uzminzdrav's Scientific Research Institute for Sanitation, Hygiene and Work-Related Illnesses have shown: one-fourth of the children in rayons with intensive pesticide use have functional health deviations.

[Kruzhilin] In view of such facts, the passivity of the agroindustry and "Selkhozkhimiya" seems, to put it mildly, incomprehensible.

[Yusupov] There are still no few "such facts." Consider, for example, that of the reserve supplies of that same butyphos. One must ring all the alarms, to resolve their fate as quickly as possible: a method for reprocessing, destroying or utilizing it must be found. Meanwhile, there is nothing. Furthermore, reserve supplies of the long ago banned, also very toxic chemical DDT continue to be stored. Thousands of tons of them have piled up, and there is still a tremendous amount of nonrecycleable packaging... Gosagroprom is not solving the problems of building new and rebuilding the existing toxic waste disposal sites, which, incidentally, often fail to meet sanitation standards.

I will hardly even mention the failure, virtually everywhere, to fulfill plans to introduce plant biodefense, or the fact that certificates for agricultural food products, indicating the residual quantity of pesticides and fertilizers, are issued almost nowhere. After all, as the USSR Gosagroprom and Soyuzminzdrav have indicated, these certificates should be issued mandatorily.

[Kruzhilin] Right now the early cotton has ripened. However, defoliation is slowly turning into a surprise. Perhaps this is a symptom of the development which has begun of new approaches to the requirements of ecological defense?

[Yusupov] I would like to believe that. According to the profound conviction of medical workers, it is about time for UzSSR Gosagroprom to finally achieve a breakthrough in this very important work. Through our common efforts, we must ensure a sharp improvement in the republic's ecological situation, which is causing society's legitimate alarm.

#### Evenk AO: Ecological Concerns Spawn Resistance to Turukhanskaya GES

18300106c Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 30 Aug 88 p 3

[Article by Yevgeniy Gontmakher, candidate of economic sciences: "The Second Coming of the Tunguska Meteorite"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction. Passages in boldface as published]

[Text] Our newspaper published a letter from N. Marchenko of Krasnoyarsk, "The Deputies Were Silent?," on 4 June 1988. It spoke of the forthcoming construction of a GES on the Lower Tunguska, which will destructively affect nature in the kray. The decision on it was made secretly, and voters were left facing a fact. The author asks: "How could the Krasnoyarskiy Kraispolkom agree to the construction of a GES?" The Krasnoyarskiy Kraispolkom has not answered this question at all. So, we decided to send our correspondent to this kray, in order to investigate the situation on site.

Most of us only know of this kray thanks to the Tunguska meteorite. In the 80 years since it fell, no more natural cataclysms whatsoever have disturbed life in Evenkiya. Coming here from the "mainland," one is struck by the unique primitive nature of the forests, rivers and lakes, which civilization has still not managed to cross with its iron path. However, this beauty could all be annihilated between the 20th and 21st centuries—not by a natural, but by a man-made cataclysm. It is a question of the project to build the Turukhanskaya GES on the Lower Tunguska River.

Until recently, everything went according to a set plan: the substantiating documents were first compiled in the bowels of Minenergo and Gidroproyekt, and then there was the technical and economic substantiation (TEO) of the need to erect a regular GES. After the Gosplan expert

analysis, a detailed project was developed, a lofty decision was made, and in 10 years or so yet another water reservoir would have appeared on the map. However, times are changing.

On 11 February 1988, the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies for the Evenk Autonomous Okrug decided "not to agree with the technical and economic substantiation of the construction of the Turukhanskaya GES," or, to put it simply, they did not agree with the idea itself of creating a hydroelectric plant on the Lower Tunguska. This ispolkom decision is unusual, taking into account the then typical weakness of the local agencies of power and their custom of yielding to the will of departments. It was obviously dictated by weighty considerations. By what, precisely?

From Gidroyekt's viewpoint, a new man-made sea would not cause any particular harm at all: just think, only about 10,000 people would have to be relocated—they dealt with far greater masses of people on the Volga and Dnepr. However, let us consider this figure in another way: the point is that it will undermine the bases of existence for almost half of the Evenks. Can this be disregarded just because there are only a few thousand of them there?

The TEO claims that only a few percent of the range pasture area will end up being in the zoned proposed for flooding, as though this were a trifle. However, a significant part of the grassy summer pastures which are found only in the flood plain of the Lower Tunguska and its tributaries, without which reindeer herding would be unable to exist as an economic sector, are concentrated on these few percent.

The designers think that the share of furs trapped in the area planned for flooding comprises only 0.05 percent of Union-wide procurements. However, according to information from the Scientific Research Institute for Agriculture of the Far North, this share (due to sable alone) is no less than 2.3-2.4 percent—one-fifth of the sable catch in Evenkiya. Yet, specialists from the Krasnoyarsk Department of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Hunting Resources and Fur-Breeding write: "...as a result of constructing the Turukhanskaya GES, irreparable damage will be done to the hunting industry of the small peoples of the North, as the result of losses of the most valuable flood-land plant communities, which are the best habitats for sable, squirrel, ermine, reindeer and coniferous forest game... We think that the creators of the Turukhanskaya GES project only used that part of our recommendations which were convenient for them in making their calculations, having entirely ignored the basic and main conclusions."

These are only two examples of the level of Gidroyekt's work on problems which directly affect people, whose fates are tied to reindeer herding and hunting. What alternatives have the dam-builders prepared for them? Hunters and reindeer herdsman, left without

work, will be offered three shops in the production of... souvenirs, work on fur-breeding farms, extremely unprofitable under local conditions, and fish-hatching.

Gidroyekt is unusually generous in the area of promises. For example, in order to take the national aspirations of the Evenk people "into account," it suggested renaming the future GES in Evenk. It will, as stated, extend an LEP [electric transmission line] from the energy generators of the plant being created into the center of the autonomous okrug—Tura—although, as even a fleeting glance at a map will show, it will be an extremely difficult task to put up an electric transmission line over the more than 500 kilometers across the flooded tributaries of the Lower Tunguska. The dam-builders believe that creating a water reservoir will make it possible to significantly increase the period of navigability of the Lower Tunguska, but the question of getting a ship across a dam, devoid of locks and equipped only with ship-hoists, which are extremely inconvenient to use, is avoided...

Can such non-serious approaches, moreover in such a complex national sphere, really be permitted?

It is gratifying when doctors, teachers, writers and artists appear among the Evenk people, but the growth of national self-awareness of the small peoples is related to an increase in the prestige of their traditional occupations and trades—after all, this is one of the ways to preserve national originality and culture. Reindeer herding is the basis for the Evenk way of life—business is becoming increasingly worse and worse. Billions of rubles can be found for the Turukhanskaya GES and similar projects, yet funds "are insufficient" to provide even the basic conditions of life for reindeer herdsman. Infant mortality still remains high among the native population, related, and not in the last priority, to the extreme neglect of medical service in the okrug. To this day, 200 families have no permanent housing in settlements and take shelter the year round in antediluvian tents. The reindeer herdsman are most wretchedly supplied with even the most necessary things. The existing system of boarding schools, which separate the children of the small Northern peoples from their customary way of life and do not provide full training for "civilized" life, do not justify themselves.

After all, people are no longer keeping silent, even in the most distant corners of our country. This is manifested not only in the decision by the Evenk Okrug Soviet Ispolkom. A special commission headed by Academician A.A. Trofimuk, having traveled along the Lower Tunguska, met with residents in all settlements planned for flooding. It turns out that everywhere, without exception, the local population's attitude toward building the Turukhanskaya GES is sharply negative.

In connection with doubts being expressed as to the expediency of building the Turukhanskaya GES, the USSR Council of Ministers has instructed the Academy



of Sciences Siberian Department to organize a comprehensive expedition this summer to study the conditions and problems of building new hydroelectric plants on the Angaro-Yenisey Cascade. By September, this expedition should prepare a well-developed conclusion on all debatable questions. So, does this mean that there is no cause for alarm?

This expedition to the basin of the Yenisey and Lower Tunguska (several thousand kilometers of river valleys) is only a month long! Is it possible in such a short time to bring some kind of clarity to the problem of possible ecological consequences of building the Turukhanskaya GES? The Krasnoyarskiy Institute of Biophysics believes that at least 4-5 years are required for this.

For instance, let us consider the evaluation of the probability of turning the planned water reservoir into a "dead sea," consisting of very strong salt solutions. Specialists from the "Krasnoyarskgeologiya" Association, which has been studying this area for many years, claims that the appearance of a water reservoir will cause the permafrost layer under its surface to disappear. This opens channels for the entry of an enormous quantity of salts, now contained in the depths of a shield of fossilized ice, into the Lower Tunguska. Yet, the designers from Gidroproekt are making the opposite conclusion on the basis of the same data. Who is right? This should have been resolved by a special independent commission, not by an expedition organized by the Siberian Energy Institute, which is hardly impartial in its attitude toward dam-building prospects on the Yenisey and its tributaries... In this regard, the slightest doubt in Gidroproekt's arguments should be treated as a negative conclusion on the expediency of constructing the Turukhanskaya GES. There must be a 100 percent guarantee that there will be no next ecological cataclysm!

Meanwhile, however, Gidroproekt is utterly ignoring this socioecological approach. Maneuvering under the fire of criticism, the designers staunchly pursue their line: if construction of the Turukhanskaya GES was planned to begin in 1989, it will begin precisely then. Today, Minenergo has already gained, "by way of an exception," permission for financing and has already started work to lay roads and LEP to the proposed construction site. Science is also working in concert with the ministry. A letter from Academician Y. I. Rudenko, director of the Siberian Energy Institute, to V. V. Uvachan, Evenk Party Okruzhkom first secretary, wrote that the expedition "should be ready to develop a conclusion on the question of **accelerating the design and preparation for construction of the Turukhanskaya GES** (highlighted by me.—Ye.G.)." Some lack of bias...

However, maybe it is justifiable? The country needs electric energy. Minenergo is using precisely this argument as a flag, under which yet another general assault on nature is being readied. According to the project to develop hydroelectric energy in 1990-2000, which is being considered by the USSR Council of Ministers, in

the next few years the construction of 60 (sixty!) new GES and pumped-storage hydroelectric plants should begin, each of which will have its own water reservoir. They include: the Kanevskaya GES and the Yuzhno-Ukrainskiy Energy Complex on the much-suffering Dnepr, the Unizhskaya GES and the Zaleshchinskiy Hydro-Center on the Dnestr, three new GES on the Irtysh, almost 10 dams on the Yenisey and its tributaries, etc., etc. It is frightening even to imagine what price the country will pay after 15-20 years (this is the usual time needed to construct large hydroelectric plants) in order to obtain additional energy. Will it even be needed then?

If we think the old way, in terms of extensive, outlay economics, a further increase in national economic potential is impossible without rapid growth in the production of electricity. However, we hope to convert to intensive development, which is based on energy conservation, by the end of the century. Structural changes in the economy and the introduction of fundamentally new technologies are the reason that, over the last 10-15 years, countries such as the United States and Japan have reduced the consumption of energy and other types of resources, calculated per unit of national income, by 30-40 percent. We must accomplish such a restructuring as well. Otherwise the Soviet Union will become a second-rate power. Failure to understand this and, moreover, continuing to apply concepts of the place of hydroelectric power, formed in the time of the Stalinist "plan for transforming nature," to the future is an unforgivable and costly mistake.

Society is protesting, specialists are making warnings. Is anybody listening?

**UzSSR: Foreign Tourism Seen as Key to  
Khorezm's Social, Economic Advancement**  
*18300078 Moscow OGONEK in Russian*  
*No. 39, 24 Sep-1 Oct 88 pp inside front cover, 1*

[Article by Edmund Iodkovskiy, Nikolay Kozlovskiy and Mark Shteynbok: "Khiva: From Past to Future"; first two paragraphs are OGONEK introduction. Passages in boldface as published]

[Text] One hundred fifteen years ago, Khiva, having retained the power of the khans, became part of the Russian empire. The storm of the revolution swept away the khan regime and the ancient name of the oasis—Khorezm—was reborn; the Khorezm Soviet People's Republic, which had awarded Lenin, Chicherin and Kalinin the Orders of Labor of Khorezm, existed from 1920 to 1924.

Orthodox Muslims call Khiva the second Mecca. Its mausoleums, minarets, religious schools and mosques amaze the 20th century person. The wonder of Khiva has come to us from biblical times: according to legend, it was founded by Sim, son of Noya.

### Algebra With Arithmetic

Who would have thought that, many centuries after his death, one of Khiva's sons would bring it millions of dollars?

Schoolchildren in Khiva know that Mukhammad ibn Musa al-Khorezmi (783-850) was a great mathematician: he gave the world "aldzhabr"—algebra, and "alkhorezm"—the algorithm.

Twenty centuries have passed. Somehow, an Austrian professor of mathematics, an expert on al-Khorezmi, recalled that the 1,200th year since the day of his colleague's birth would soon arrive: an anniversary! It is being observed here and throughout the world under the aegis of UNESCO. A prim delegation rolled into Khiva.

"So, have you preserved the palace of the Khiva khans?" asked the foreign guests, for whom European comfort is customary, but Asian exoticism is attractive as well.

The Europeans were received with pomp. My guide recalls: "I showed them Kunya-Ark. The Europeans were amazed. The inlaid walls flow on and on, playing with every color of the rainbow. We refreshed our distinguished guests with the famous Khorezm melons and watermelons. After the melons and watermelons, someone wanted to use the local conveniences. There was mild embarrassment among the hosts then: well, what can you do? The city soviet has no funds for improvements and equipment for stylish toilets. Yet, after all, our Khiva is, all in all, the rayon center!... Naturally, world society was shocked by such inconveniences in the birthplace of a genius. The Austrian mathematician said: 'Oh, you need a loan! Or, more precisely, a grant!'"

A grant never hurts. Surprisingly, once the Austrian and his wife had started the ball rolling, UNESCO allocated a non-repayable loan of 2 million dollars to the Khiva city soviet. It was a royal gift for the city budget. The lion's share went for a sewer system. They laid the foundation for an Inturist hotel. They have been building for 3 years, and they have only put up the second floor! A modest part of the money was allocated for restoration. All of the rest went into a majestic monument to al-Khorezm in Urgench...

"Honor and glory to al-Khorezmi, to whom I have devoted my life!"—the Austrian professor even shed a few tears at the opening of the monument. They applauded him with all their heart...

Thus, with the help of al-Khorezmi, Khiva is also moving towards civilization. What struck me most of all was the fact that until 1970 Khiva was for some reason considered a forbidden zone for foreign tourists: evidently, someone feared pilgrimages to Muslim sacred places, such as the mausoleum of Pakhlavan Makhmud.

It has already been 20 years since Khiva was declared a city-preserve, but this has changed its fate little. The UNESCO grant was a drop in the sea. Khiva deserves more. Its palaces and fortress walls need more than just cosmetic repair, but genuine scientific restoration. After all, Khiva is a pearl of world civilization.

Algebra was born in Khorezm, but the arithmetic of civilization was late in coming.

Therefore, evidently, they do not take Japanese, American and other foreign tourists into the god-forsaken part of Khiva, where there is not a single sapling under the scorching sun in the house courtyards, where Khiva has still not scrambled out from under all sorts of feudal customs. Here there are poor, blind walls of single-story homes made from adobe brick, ruins in the backyards of the palaces and minarets; at times, it seems as though the ruins were left on purpose, to say "see how people in Khiva lived under the accursed khan regime!..."

"It looks like..." my guide sighs. "Our previous oblast leaders truly lived as well as the khans. They traveled abroad, they 'did not notice' how the simple people took shelter on the land of Khiva... Stagnation! It also touched us... We have felt it on our own skin."

### Choice of Strategy

How to get rid of stagnation? How to give the people a normal human life?! These thoughts trouble the mind of Mirakhmat Mirkhadzhiyevich Mirkasymov, party obkom first secretary. He has received a most difficult inheritance. Khorezm Oblast was last in Uzbekistan in terms of almost all indicators. The industrial and agricultural labor productivity of Khorezm drops from year to year: over the last 5 years, in kolkhozes it has fallen by 5 percent, in industry—by 6, and in sovkhoses—by an entire 13 percent.

There are many people in Khorezm, about a million. In Khivinskiy Rayon alone there are 120,000 people living in 180 square kilometers, which is 666 people per square kilometer! Yet, all of these square kilometers and hectares, which are planted, moreover, on a single-crop basis with cotton, should still feed a million-strong population.

The oblast has a very high infant mortality. Meanwhile, population growth continues, exacerbating social problems to the limit. Few wish to leave to find work: the homeland is nicer!

"On the average, a peasant has seven children," says M.M. Mirkasymov, "and a city dweller has six. Yet everyone must be given work. Everyone knows that here three sometimes make ends meet with the salary of one? However, everything pivots on the problem of new jobs..."

The big question: how can the economy of this region be uplifted? Perhaps, a gigantic electronics plant could be put up on the bank of the Amu? Mirkasymov has

entertained this frivolous thought, but there are no skilled work cadres, there are no people to do such work! An agricultural region, the share of peasants in the overall population exceeds 70 percent...

Should all efforts be focused on agriculture? At one time such a formulation of the question would have been appropriate, but today...

"Calculations indicate that the modern machine harvesting of cotton does not require such a quantity of people," M.M. Mirkasymov asserts, "yet nevertheless, machine harvesting is the future. The problem is that there are far too many people in agriculture... We have one recourse—to develop a tourism industry, international tourism! At first glance this strategy seems unexpected. I think that, under our conditions, it is justifiable. A tourism industry would make it possible to start up approximately 30 sectors in industry and the municipal economy!

After all, we do have something to show: Khiva is a unique monument to ancient culture. Have we, perhaps, forgotten the secrets of our fathers and grandfathers, the secrets for glazing ceramics, the secrets of majolica, of our national ornamentation, of silk embroideries and wood carving? We have engravers and jewelry makers, silk masters," he continues, becoming distracted. "Sculptures and potters... Khorezm carpets, rugs and belts have been famous since time immemorial! Really, do we not know what tempts tourists?! Khorezm needs an express trolley from Urgench to Khiva, as well as from Simferopol to Yalta... Roads. A luxury airport in Urgench. Hotels and motels, restaurants—everything should be first-class! Everything should conform to international standards."

"Of course, these are all dreams. How can they be turned into specific projects? Money, an enormous amount, is needed. At first, the leaders of Inturist promised to contribute half a million dollars, but this is a miserly sum. With this amount of money, not only will you not attain an international level—you will not provide tourists with the basic amenities!"

"Let us consider where to find funds for this idea. Previously, we would most likely have begged from the state, but now we are counting on enterprise. Naturally, to start with we created a consortium... (Mirkasymov pronounces the unaccustomed word, savoring it). We named it

"Khorezm." We combined within it the resources of 24 industrial and transportation enterprises of the oblast for the joint financing of a tourism industry."

"Okay, now we need hard currency. The Moscow 'Sotrudnichestvo' Cooperative has become an intermediary in business relations between Khorezm tourism organizers, Inturist, and the large Norwegian design firm, Bergmos. Incidentally, Bergmos stands for 'Bergen-Moscow!'" Mirkasymov emphasizes...

V.Ya. Pavlov, Inturist chairman, met with the founders of the joint enterprise in Moscow and spoke of Inturist's great interest in developing tourism in Central Asia and of its readiness to finance work in Khiva for up to 100 million dollars.

There was no need to encourage the resourceful Norwegians: tourism is a profitable business. The president of the company, Bjorn Instanes, is ready to put down millions of crowns tomorrow. Thus, the dreams of the people of Khorezm are materializing. The 12 million rubles which our consortium has invested, the millions of Inturist dollars, and the Norwegian millions comprise the prescribed fund for the joint tourism enterprise, "Khiva." The Soviet share in the prescribed fund is 58 percent, the Norwegian—42. The profit will be distributed accordingly.

The overall preparation and agreement on the documents has already been finished. The signing of the establishing contract will be held in Khiva at the end of this year.

A few days later, M. Mirkasymov was elected first secretary of the Tashkent Party Obkom. However, the work which he started will be developed. It can no longer be stopped.

The Muslim Friday has begun and a service is being held at noon at the functioning Seid-Shelikerbay Mosque. The people of Khiva, handfuls of old men, kneeling, simultaneously prostrate themselves, heads toward Mecca. The elders are praying to the single and omnipotent Allah. What are they praying for?

Maybe they are praying that this land will revive and become beautiful and rich. One can put one's trust in Allah, but, more likely, one must above all work hard and honestly, so that this ancient and blessed oasis called Khiva will once again be made prosperous.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.



This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

#### SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301 (Telephone (202) 373-3771, Autovon 243-3771).

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

14 Feb 89